

of similar interest

THE MESSAGE OF THE GĪTĀ

as interpreted by Sri Aurobindo
edited by Adilbaran Roy

This commentary summarizes the substance of Sri Aurobindo's famous book *Essays on the Gītā*, of which the *Calcutta Statesman* said: "It carries to a new perfection the difficult task of expounding Hindu thought to the West."

THE ORIGINAL GITA

The Song of the Supreme
Exalted One



WITH COPIOUS COMMENTS AND NOTES BY

RUDOLF OTTO

author of "The Idea of The Holy," etc., etc.

TRANSLATED AND EDITED BY

J. E. TURNER

M.A., PH.D.

*Reader in Philosophy in the
University of Liverpool,
Assistant Editor of the
"Library of Philosophy,"
author of "The Nature of
Deity," "Essentials in the
Development of Religion,"
etc.*

London

George Allen and Unwin Ltd

The German originals
DER SANG DES HEHR-ERHABENEN
DIE URGESTALT DER BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ
DIE LEHR-TRAKTATE DER BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ

were published in Stuttgart
in 1933, 1934 and 1935

FIRST PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH IN 1939

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
in 11-Point Old Style Type
BY UNWIN BROTHERS LIMITED
WOKING

RICHARD GARBE

smaraṇārtham

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

IN INDIA, to a very great extent, *The Bhagavad-gītā* occupies the exalted position that *The New Testament*, and especially *The Gospel of St John*, holds in the religious world of the West. It is proclaimed by Krishna, the incarnate Form of the Only and Eternal God of the Universe, Whose names are Vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa, Vishnu and Hari; and its full Title runs thus:—*Śrīmad-bhagavad-gītā-upanishadas*, the last three terms meaning: “The teaching given by Bhagavat in song and recitation”, while *Śrīmad* may be taken as equivalent to “sublime” or “exalted”, and associated with either *bhagavat* or *gītā-upanishadas*. Thus the Book is called either “The teaching given in song by the Supreme Exalted One”, or “The sublime teaching given by the Supreme”. Of these the first is the more probable, since in the Book itself Krishna is constantly referred to as *Śrī-bhagavat*—The Supreme Exalted One; the term *bhagavat* generally denoting either some venerable religious personage or God Himself. In this instance, however, it indicates both:—Krishna as the Incarnation of God, and the Very God Who is incarnate in him.

In India again, and also by Western commentators, the Work is regarded principally as the fundamental doctrinal *Text* of Hindu “*Bhakti* religion”. This, in the first place; is the religious attitude which in trust, faith and love turns to the Personal God Who is the Redeemer from the evil of *samsāra*—of a wandering existence or migration in the Universe, but in its modern form it combines, together with the theology that originates from the spiritual attitude just referred to, doctrines selected from the expanding systems of *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*¹, from the ancient moralistic doctrine of the three *gunas* or “constituents of Nature”,

¹ cf further pp. 117 ff., 162 ff., 204 ff., 273 ff.

from the theology of the old Vedic sacrificial cult and, finally, from Vedantic speculation and soteriological teaching about the transcendent, super-personal *Brahman* which arise from this cult.

The present-day guise of *The Bhagavad-gītā*, however, is not its original version; and I trust that I have succeeded in proving, in Chapter IV, that it is actually based upon a primitive *Text*—*The Original Gītā*—which itself was in no sense whatever specifically doctrinal writ, and therefore no “*Upanishad*”, but simply a fragment of most magnificent epic narrative. The Book is, in fact, embedded in the vast ancient Epic, *The Mahābhārata*,¹ which has itself undergone the most diverse transformations, interpolations and perhaps even occasional abbreviations: it recounts the great and horrible fratricidal battle between the Kauravas and the Pāndavas. Krishna, who is on the side of the latter, once again visits the Kauravas in order to treat for peace; the aged King Dhritarāshtra (The Strong Ruler), himself desires this, but their leader, his son Duryodhana (The Unconquerable), frustrates his efforts and wishes to take Krishna prisoner: who thereupon, since he is himself the Supreme God in human form, reveals His divine Power in order to terrify Duryodhana. Compelled to allow him to escape, they nevertheless persist in war; and the hosts, drawn up for battle, confront each other. But now Duryodhana is assailed by anxious forebodings as to the issue of the strife; the contest, nonetheless, is about to begin.

Between the two armies, thus arrayed, rides the Pāndavas' foremost champion, Arjuna, mustering the ranks and accompanied by Krishna as the driver of his chariot; and as the strong and valiant hero gazes at the peoples' opposing each other, brothers as they are, the noblest horror of the dreadful fratricidal fury that is about to begin seizes him; he too becomes weak and dejected, certainly not by any

¹ Book VI, *Bhīshmaparvan*, Section 6.

misgivings about the result of the struggle, but rather by being compelled to annihilate "those who are my own people".¹ Serious doubt and heavy grief oppress him, because he must slay those whom he himself reveres and to whom he is greatly indebted, and because by this strife he will plunge into grievous confusion the most sacred laws of kindred and family.

From this mood of despair Krishna intervenes to release him; and thus *The Samvâda* begins—the dialogue in which Krishna consoles Arjuna with old mysterious sayings about the indestructibility of those whom Arjuna believes he can and must destroy; He appeals, too, to his martial honour. All this, however, is not the most important feature; for finally Krishna does much more. First of all, by instruction, He declares to Arjuna His "supreme utterance",² and reveals to him that what is now happening is not the work of man and proceeds not from the human will, but is the Deed and Will of the Eternal God of Destiny Himself, Who decides and ordains all things, and Whom Arjuna must obey as His "tool".³

Just as, a short time before, He had shown Himself to Duryodhana in His divine might, in order to disarm the miscreant who contemplated treachery against Him, so now in a stupendous Self-revelation of His divine Power He manifests Himself to Arjuna to lead him to obey the supreme divine decree, showing him the true meaning of the occurrence of the battle. It is not his affair to decide here; he must be nothing whatever except the instrument of the Omnipotent One Who thus fulfils His own purpose; and so He subdues Arjuna's resistance and induces him to acknowledge his readiness to obey.⁴

¹ *The Gîtâ*, I, 31.

² X, 1.

³ XI, 33: "Be thou nought but My tool."

⁴ These subtle parallels and contrasts of sublime epic construction cannot and must not be ignored. Exactly as Duryodhana is the victim of anxiety, so too is Arjuna; similarly, a Theophany is per-

from the theology of the old Vedic sacrificial cult and, finally, from Vedantic speculation and soteriological teaching about the transcendent, super-personal *Brahman* which arise from this cult.

The present-day guise of *The Bhagavad-gītā*, however, is not its original version; and I trust that I have succeeded in proving, in Chapter IV, that it is actually based upon a primitive *Text*—*The Original Gītā*—which itself was in no sense whatever specifically doctrinal writ, and therefore no “*Upanishad*”, but simply a fragment of most magnificent epic narrative. The Book is, in fact, embedded in the vast ancient Epic, *The Mahābhārata*,¹ which has itself undergone the most diverse transformations, interpolations and perhaps even occasional abbreviations: it recounts the great and horrible fratricidal battle between the Kauravas and the Pāndavas. Krishna, who is on the side of the latter, once again visits the Kauravas in order to treat for peace; the aged King Dhritarāshtra (The Strong Ruler), himself desires this, but their leader, his son Duryodhana (The Unconquerable), frustrates his efforts and wishes to take Krishna prisoner: who thereupon, since he is himself the Supreme God in human form, reveals His divine Power in order to terrify Duryodhana. Compelled to allow him to escape, they nevertheless persist in war; and the hosts, drawn up for battle, confront each other. But now Duryodhana is assailed by anxious forebodings as to the issue of the strife; the contest, nonetheless, is about to begin.

Between the two armies, thus arrayed, rides the Pāndavas' foremost champion, Arjuna, mustering the ranks and accompanied by Krishna as the driver of his chariot; and as the strong and valiant hero gazes at the peoples opposing each other, brothers as they are, the noblest horror of the dreadful fratricidal fury that is about to begin seizes him; he too becomes weak and dejected, certainly not by any

¹ Book VI, *Bhīshmaparvan*, Section 6.

misgivings about the result of the struggle, but rather by being compelled to annihilate "those who are my own people".¹ Serious doubt and heavy grief oppress him, because he must slay those whom he himself reveres and to whom he is greatly indebted, and because by this strife he will plunge into grievous confusion the most sacred laws of kindred and family.

From this mood of despair Krishna intervenes to release him; and thus *The Samvāda* begins—the dialogue in which Krishna consoles Arjuna with old mysterious sayings about the indestructibility of those whom Arjuna believes he can and must destroy; He appeals, too, to his martial honour. All this, however, is not the most important feature; for finally Krishna does much more. First of all, by instruction, He declares to Arjuna His "supreme utterance",² and reveals to him that what is now happening is not the work of man and proceeds not from the human will, but is the Deed and Will of the Eternal God of Destiny Himself, Who decides and ordains all things, and Whom Arjuna must obey as His "tool".³

Just as, a short time before, He had shown Himself to Duryodhana in His divine might, in order to disarm the miscreant who contemplated treachery against Him, so now in a stupendous Self-revelation of His divine Power He manifests Himself to Arjuna to lead him to obey the supreme divine decree, showing him the true meaning of the occurrence of the battle. It is not his affair to decide here; he must be nothing whatever except the instrument of the Omnipotent One Who thus fulfils His own purpose; and so He subdues Arjuna's resistance and induces him to acknowledge his readiness to obey.⁴

¹ *The Gītā*, I, 31.

² X, 1

³ XI, 33: "Be thou nought but My tool."

⁴ These subtle parallels and contrasts of sublime epic construction cannot and must not be ignored. Exactly as Duryodhana is the victim of anxiety, so too is Arjuna; similarly, a Theophany is per-

This portion of the narrative, then, is the very climax of the whole Epic, revealing as it does the guise assumed by the ancient traditional material of an earlier mighty fratricidal struggle to the mind of a profound poet who gave it its later form, while at the same moment it witnesses to the sublimity and depth attained by the idea of God in certain circles in ancient India. Essentially, nevertheless, the *Krishna-Arjuna-Samvāda*, as it may most suitably be styled, was in no sense whatever a manual of instruction, but purely and entirely a splendid epic fragment; not the doctrinal literature of any system nor, again, a catechism attached to any creed, and least of all of syncretistic Hinduism in general. It was, then, into this old and primitive fragment of the Epic itself, as the matrix, that "doctrinal writ" subsequently became inserted, with the view of securing for it the authority of Krishna's divine Form, and in Chapters V, VI, I have segregated these doctrinal Treatises, individually, from the primitive *Text* of *The Original Gīlā*, and at the same time advanced my reasons for their selection, together with the specific characterization of each of these doctrinal Sections. These two Chapters, therefore, discuss the so-called "Introductory Problems" of *The Gītā* of to-day, in such a way as to free the Translation of *The Gītā* itself, so far as is possible, from all extraneous matter; this seemed to me the best method to adopt.

With the historical aspects of the religious development of the great idea of God subsisting behind "Īśvara", the "Lord", of *The Gītā* I have already dealt elsewhere,¹ with *Bhakti* religion, too, in *India's Religion of Grace and*

cerved by them both. The former is deeply concerned about the issue of the contest, the latter about the violation of the sacred laws of piety. Duryodhana's cunning is unmasked by the Theophany, while Arjuna is accepted as a tool for the exalted deeds of God, although he is at the same time humbled because of his "wilfulness".

¹ "Nārāyana, seine Herkunft und seine Synonyme"; *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, 10, 1934.

Christianity Compared and Contrasted, together with the *Introductions* to my translations of the documents of this religion appended to that volume.¹

The course followed by the interpretation of *The Gītā* and its associated controversies, together with a detailed discussion of earlier translations, is traced in *The Bhagavad-gītā*, by W. Douglas P. Hill, which also includes the Sanskrit *Text* and a very carefully annotated version, while an Index of all Works referring to *The Gītā* appears in Etienne Lamotte's *Notes sur la Bhagavad-gītā*,² which also includes an outline of *Le Milieu d'éclosion de la Bhagavad-gītā* and a discussion of its *Doctrines spéculatives*, in connection with an extremely pertinent investigation of the terminology. Both Hill and Lamotte regard it as possible to maintain the unity of *The Gītā*; I cannot myself accept this view, however, and should on the contrary prefer, as his grateful pupil, to carry still farther Richard Garbe's magnificent and thoughtful analytical survey; his Work, *Die Bhagavad-gītā*,³ and his expositions of Bhāgavata religion, will always constitute a classic in research into Indian religions, especially so far as *The Gītā* is concerned. With Garbe's selection of later interpolations, due to exponents of ancient Vedic sacrificial theology and speculation about *Brahman*, I agree in the majority of cases; I differ from him, however, as I have indicated in Chapter IV, on the following points:—

(i). *The Gītā*, in its entirety, was not dovetailed into the Epic at some late period; rather was *The Original Gītā* a genuine constituent of this Epic when it became "Krishnaized". This *Original Gītā*, once again, is no construction by some theologian, nor is it doctrinal literature, but is essentially the masterpiece of an indisputably great epic poet, of the genius, in fact, who could imagine so splendid a figure as that of Karna. More especially is the magnificent

¹ Appendices, pp. 111 ff.

² Paris, 1929; pp. 138-144.

³ Leipzig, 1905 and 1921.

Theophany of Chapter XI the creation of an epic poet. It is, in fact, a quite obvious parallel to the Theophany in which Krishna has already revealed Himself to Duryodhana, except that it presents more forcible aspects and has a quite different aim.

The Original Gītā then, to repeat, is no doctrinal *Text*, no doctrinal writ of *Bhakti* religion, but rather Krishna's own voice and deed, referring directly to the situation in which Arjuna finds himself; intended, however, not to proclaim to him any transcendent dogma of salvation, but to render him willing to undertake the special service of the Almighty Will of the God Who decides the fate of battles.

(2). The remainder of the material, which must be discriminated from *The Original Gītā*, consists of individual "Doctrinal Treatises", to some degree of a highly specific and peculiar type, which I have discussed in fuller detail in Chapters V, VI.

(3). Isolated expressions, derived from *Brahman* terminology, do not of themselves substantiate later interpolation, since terms such as *Brahma-Nirvāna* or *Brahma-bhava* had for long been somewhat loose general equivalents for a transcendent enjoyment of salvation.

(4). The Great Personal God of *Bhakti* is also a *Universal God*, Who Himself "is" the Universe, which He includes within His own Being.¹

(5). The chronology of *The Original Gītā* depends on that of the "Krishnaized" Epic, but is independent of the chronology of the interpolated Doctrinal Treatises. The Third Century B.C., therefore, is perhaps too low a limit for *The Original Gītā* itself, while the insertion of the individual Treatises may have been effected very much later, and was presumably a rather prolonged process.

With regard to the Glosses marked by Vedic and Vedantic tendencies, again, I may suggest one further consideration

¹ cf. p. 295.

to those already advanced by Garbe. For it is evident that they pursue the path of the later, and avowedly Brahmanic, *Anugītā*; Krishna, indeed, subsequently relates this to Arjuna because Arjuna has ostensibly forgotten *The Gītā* itself! and its obvious trend is to outbid *The Gītā*, if not to replace it altogether, by "Brahmanizing" it; *The Anugītā*, therefore, proves that such tendencies undoubtedly existed. In that case the Glosses of *The Gītā* are themselves in accord with an unmistakable propensity to "Brahmanize". It will therefore be no error to assume that they constituted the initial attempts to immunize *The Gītā*, in the sense of the same "Brahmanizing" direction which afterwards operated still more thoroughly and radically in *The Anugītā*.

With the specific tendencies characterizing *Bhakti* theology I have dealt in Chapter V, and with the yet more important features of *The Gītā*—*Yoga* and the *yogins*—in Chapter III.

My own version of *The Original Gītā*, omitting all that I regard as interpolated material, appears as Chapter I, while Chapter II includes this, together with the interpolations, so as to present *The Song* in its entirety. In the first of these two Chapters, therefore, the following Sections appear consecutively, with no interruptions, so that they can be read in this order, should this be preferred:—

The Gītā, I: II, 1-13; 20; 22; 29-37: X, 1-8: XI, 1-6; 8-12; 14; 17; 19-36; 41-51: XVIII, 58-61; 66; 72; 73; while in the entire *Gītā* these Sections appear in heavy type.

Chapters IV-VI then present my analysis of the whole *Gītā* of to-day into its individual components, together with the justification for this discrimination, as well as for the distinctive characteristics of each doctrinal Section, and the various spiritual tendencies expressed in *The Original Gītā*, the Treatises and the Glosses.

I contemplate with deep reverence, in conclusion, the great unknown Hindu who could visualize such a magnificent

Drama as is related in his Eleventh Chapter, and who succeeded in giving this its present form.

I dedicate the Volume, in gratitude, to Richard Garbe's memory. It is now thirty years since he honoured the beginner into research into Religion. I wish to dedicate it, therefore, to him as the scholar who laid down the imperishable foundation for the true historical comprehension of *The Gītā*.

.

RUDOLF OTTO

MARBURG, 1935

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

IN translating Dr. Otto's rendering of *The Bhagavad-Gītā* I have followed, so far as it has been possible, Dr. E. J. Thomas's well-known version, *The Song of the Lord*; and for permission to do this I am deeply indebted to Dr. Thomas himself, and to the Publisher, Mr. John Murray; to the former, also, for his valuable assistance in dealing with Sanskrit terms.

There are, at the same time, frequent important variations from Dr. Thomas's own *Text*, although it has not been possible to indicate these in detail. The square brackets, again, include elucidatory terms from *The Song of the Lord*; and I trust that this device has not affected the reading of the great Epic, strictly as such.

A second important feature is that the *Text* of the original Epic, as distinct from all subsequent interpolations of various kinds, or of *Die Urgītā*, to use Dr. Otto's own Title, appears in bold type, while the interpolations themselves are in ordinary type. Dr. Otto's transliteration of the Sanskrit terms has also been retained.

As on previous occasions, my thanks are due to my wife for dealing with various important details, and for reading the proofs; and finally, to the Publishers for their close interest in the production of the work.

A Note on Pronunciation may be useful: *s* being pronounced as *sh*, *c* as *tsh* and *j* as *dsh*.

J. E. TURNER

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Author's Preface	9
Translator's Note	17
I. <i>THE ORIGINAL GĪTĀ</i>	21
II. <i>ŚRĪMAD-BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ:</i> THE SONG OF THE SUPREME EXALTED ONE	34
III. <i>YOGA AND THE YOGINS</i>	117
IV. THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE <i>BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ</i>	132
V. THE DOCTRINAL TREATISES OF THE SECOND PART OF THE <i>BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ</i> : I-IV	162
VI. THE TREATISES OF THE FIRST PART OF THE <i>GĪTĀ</i> : V-VIII	203
VII. APPENDICES	237
VIII. CONCLUDING NOTES	280
Bibliography	303
Index	305

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINAL GĪTĀ

(Omitting all interpolations).

I

1 Dhritarāshtra:

Assembled on the sacred field, the Kuru field, eager for battle, what did my people and the Pāndavas do, O Samjaya?

2 Samjaya:

Duryodhana, the King, saw the army of the Pāndavas, drawn up in battle-line. He approached his teacher (Drona) and spoke to him these words:

3 "Behold, O Teacher, this mighty host of the sons of Pāndu, drawn up in battle array by the son of Drupada, thy wise disciple. 4 There are heroes, great archers, equal in fight to Bhima and Arjuna, Yuyudhāna, Virāta and Drupada the great warrior charioteer, 5 Drishtraketu, Cekitāna, and the valiant King of the Kaśis; also Purujit, Kuntibhoja and the Prince of the Śibis, the hero, 6 Yudhāmanyu the brave and Uttamaujas the valiant, Saubhadra's son and the sons of Draupadī, all great warrior charioteers.

7 But know those that are the chief of *our* side, the leaders of *my* army. So that thou mayest know them, I will name them to thee: 8 Thyself (Drona), then Bhīshma, Karna, Kripa, victorious in battle, Aśvatthāman and Vikarna and Somadatta's son, 9 and many other heroes, ready to renounce their lives for me. With divers kinds of weapons they are all skilled in fighting, 10 and yet this force of ours, though led by the (well experienced) Bhīshma himself, is insufficient, while their force, led by Bhīma, is sufficient (for victory)."

11 (Addressed to the bystanders): "So all ye therefore, arrayed in your respective ranks, heed my command that ye give Bhishma special protection."

12 (When Bhishma heard this), in order to give Duryodhana courage the glorious Kuru elder sounded the war cry, mighty as the lion's roar, and blew his conch, 13 and straightway the conchs, the kettledrums, drums, tabors and the "cow-mouths" (of the other leaders) sounded deeply forth; there was a wild uproar. 14 And straightway too, (from the Pāndavas' ranks) Mādhava (Krishna) and the son of Pāndu (Arjuna), standing side by side in their mighty war chariot yoked with white steeds, blew their magnificent conchs. 15 Hrishīkeśa (Krishna) blew his Pāñcajanya, the treasure gainer (Arjuna) his Devadatta horn, Vrikodara of terrible deeds the mighty horn Paundra. 16 The King himself, Yudhishthira, son of Kuntī, blew Anantavijaya, Nakula and Sahadeva, (his brothers), Sughoṣha and Manipushpaka, 17 and likewise, far around, the Prince of the Kāśis, finest of archers, and Śikandhin the warrior charioteer, Dhrishtadyumna and Virāta, Sātyaki the unconquered, 18 Drūpada and the sons of Draupadī and the son of Saubhadrā, the mighty armed, severally blew their conchs. 19 So wild was the uproar that, resounding through Heaven and Earth, it rent the hearts of the sons of Dhritarāshtra.

20 And even as the arrows began to fly (Arjuna) the son of Pāndu, whose crest was an ape, seized his bow, gazed (contemplatively) at the sons of Dhritarāshtra 21 and then spoke to Hrishīkeśa:

Arjuna:

Here, between the two armies, stay my chariot, O Acyuta, 22 so that I may behold them standing, eager for the fray. What kind of men shall I have to face in this hard battle? 23 I would ponder and examine who these warriors are, gathered here to please the evil minded Duryodhana.

24 *Samjaya:*

Hrishikeśa, thus addressed by Gudākeśa, straightway stayed the best of chariots between the two armies, 25 in the face of Bhishma, Drona and all the other princes (of the foe), and said: "Behold these assembled Kurus". 26 And Pārtha saw standing there fathers and grandfathers, teachers, uncles, brothers, sons, grandsons and companions, 27 fathers-in-law and friends in both armies. Beholding all these kinsmen arrayed, 28 he was moved with deepest pity. Tremblingly he spoke:

Arjuna:

As I see these my own people, (on this side and on that), arrayed eager for battle, 29 my limbs fail. My mouth is parched. Trembling comes upon my body and my hair stands on end. 30 Gāndīva slips from my hand, my skin burns all over. Hardly can I stand, and my mind is in a whirl. 31 I see adverse signs, O Keśava, nor do I find any advantage if I slay those who are my own people in battle. 32 I wish not for victory, nor lordship nor pleasures (of conquest). For what is lordship to us? What are enjoyments or life itself? 33 They for whose sake we desire lordship, enjoyments and pleasures, stand here in battle, abandoning wealth and life: 34 teachers and fathers and sons and grandfathers, fathers-in-law, grandsons, brothers-in-law and other kinsfolk. 35 Them *I wish not to slay*, though slain myself—not for lordship over the three Worlds, much less for mere lordship over the Earth. 36 In laying low the sons of Dhritarāshtra, what delight would be ours? Nought but *sin* would overtake us as archcriminals, were we to slay these. 37 We dare not slay those who are our own kinsfolk. For if we slay our own kin, how should we ourselves ever be happy? 38 Even if they, blinded by greed, see no wrong in destroying kin, nor crime in betraying friends, 39 how should *we*, who see the wrong, not know how to turn away from that *sin*

(being endowed with insight)? 40 When kin are destroyed the ancient and sacred kin laws themselves perish. But when the law is destroyed, lawlessness overcomes the whole kin. 41 Consequently the kinswomen are corrupted. But when the women are corrupted, straightway there arises confusion of caste. 42 But this must lead the destroyers of kin, and likewise the kin itself, to Hell, and the ancestors of the kin, because they are deprived of gifts to ancestors, plunge downwards (from the celestial *pitri-loka*¹). 43 Thus through these sins of the kin destroyers, that cause confusion of caste, both the primeval caste laws and the kin laws are ruined. 44 But the abode ordained for men who have no kin laws is ever in Hell, as the sacred precepts teach us. 45 Alas! great sin we have resolved to commit, in that out of greed for the pleasures of lordship, we are prepared to slay our own people. 46 Rather may the sons of Dhritarāshtra with weapons in hand slay me, unresisting and weaponless, in the battle (than that I should burden myself with such sin).

47 *Samjaya:*

Thus, pending the battle, Arjuna spoke and dropped his bow and arrows and, his mind shaken with grief, sank down on the chariot seat.

II

1 To him, moved by pity, his eyes filled by tears and grief, despondent, Madhusūdana spoke thus:

2 *The Supreme:*

Whence in this strait has come upon thee this baseness, unseemly in the noble, excluding from Heaven, and causing disgrace, O Arjuna?

3 Yield not to such unmanliness: that befits thee not.

¹ The world of the Fathers.

Abandon such base weakness of heart. Stand up, O Oppressor of the enemy!

4 *Arjuna:*

How shall I fight in battle with arrows against Bhishma, against Drona, both of whom deserve all veneration from me?

5 Much better is it to eat the common food of beggars here, So as to be free from sin against such worthy teachers! Even though they are filled with desire for gain—to slay them

Would besmear all pleasure as with blood.

6 And who can say which is the more to be desired:

For us to conquer them or for them to conquer us? For without them we ourselves should not wish to live, Even the sons of Dhritarâshtra arrayed before us.

7 Perplexity has evilly befallen me,

My sense of right and wrong is confused.

I ask Thee, tell me with certainty, which now would be better.

I am Thy disciple. Teach me: to Thee I flee.

8 Even if I should attain prosperous and secure lordship on Earth, or even sovereignty among the gods,

I see not what would drive away the sorrow that dries up the power of my senses.

9 *Samjaya:*

Thus Gudâkeśa addressed Hrishikeśa. “*I will not fight*”—said he once more to Govinda. Then he became silent.

10 Then Krishna, with (a gracious) smile, spoke to the despondent one between the two armies these words.

11 *The Supreme:*

Thou utterest wise things—and yet thou sorrowest for whom thou shouldst not sorrow. Whether vitality has vanished or not—for that the wise grieve not. 12 Never at any time was

I not, nor thou, nor these lords of men. Nor shall any of us ever cease to be hereafter. 23 For as in this his actual body (one and the same) dweller therein passes successively through the conditions of childhood, manhood and age, (without losing his identity), even so is it with the acquisition of yet another body. The intelligent man is not confused (by the bodily change).

20 It is born not, nor does it ever die.

Nor shall it, after having been *brought into being*,
hereafter come not to be.

Permanent, eternal, ancient, unborn,
This dies not, even when the body perishes.

22 As a man casts off old clothes,

In order to put on, instead, other new ones,
So the embodied one casts away the worn out bodies
And puts on new garb.

29 As marvellous one man looks upon it,

Likewise as marvellous another speaks of it,
And as marvellous another hears of it.

But not one—even when he has heard of it—knows it.

30 (Therefore), O Arjuna, this embodied one itself in the body of everyone is ever invulnerable. Therefore for no creature shouldst thou sorrow (believing that it can annihilate itself).

31 But equally little shouldst thou tremble, when thou seekest thy own *duty*. For there is nought better to a warrior than righteous war. 32 With joy warriors take up such a fight, offered freely to them (from no fault of their own), as the open door of Heaven. 33 Shouldst thou refuse to undertake this righteous warfare, then thou wilt cast away thy own duty (over which thou art sorrowing), and also thy good name, and fall into sin. 34 And (with justice) people will speak of thy undying dishonour. And to an honourable man dishonour is worse than death. 35 The warrior charioteers will think that thou hast held back from battle through fear. Thou wilt

fall into contempt, even among those who honoured thee; 36 while they that have ill will to thee will say things of thee that cannot be gainsaid, mocking thy warlike valour. What is there worse than that for a warrior? 37 Either thou wilt fall and attain Heaven, or thou wilt conquer and gain the Earth. Therefore arise, O son of Kuntī, resolved on war.

X

1 *The Supreme:*

Now hear further My *supreme* utterance; because thou art dear to Me, I will proclaim it to thee for thy good.

2 Neither the hosts of *devas* nor the great *rishis*¹ know My source. (For) altogether more ancient than they am I. 3 He who knows Me as the unborn, the beginningless, the great Lord of the world, *he* among mortals, free from delusion, is released from all sins.

4 From Me alone arise of beings the manifold states of mind: power of decision, judgment (*buddhi*), knowledge, purity of spirit, capacity to endure, true insight, discipline, serenity, pleasure and pain, well-being and distress, fear and reliance, 5 compassion, equanimity, contentment, self-control, doing good, glory and infamy. 6 (Likewise the primeval beings), the seven great *rishis* and the four *Manus*,² (arose only) from Me, generated by My Spirit; (and) from them descend these creatures in the world. 7 He who knows in truth this manifestation of My Might and My creative Power is armed with unshakable constancy.

8 I am the source of all, from Me everything arises—

Whoso has insight knows this. And with this insight he worships Me, impressed by awe.

¹ Gods and sages.

² Ancient sages.

XI

1 *Arjuna:*

Thou hast proclaimed, in order to comfort me, the supreme secret of the true Self (and also its indestructibility). Through this Thy Word my bewilderment is gone from me, 2 for as it is appointed to beings to exist and to pass away, so verily has it been in my own experience. And likewise hast Thou taught me Thy imperishable Majesty.

3 I desire to behold with my eyes this Thy Form as God, O *Purushottama*,¹ even as Thou Thyself hast (just) declared it, O Supreme Lord. 4 If, O Lord, Thou deemest that I am able to behold it, then show me Thyself as the Imperishable, O Lord of wondrous Power.

5 *The Supreme:*

“Behold then, O Pārtha, My hundredfold and thousandfold Forms, manifold, divine, of many colours and shapes: 6 behold the *Ādityas*, *Vasus*, *Rudras*, the two *Aśvins* and the *Maruts*. Behold many marvels, such as were never seen before.

8 But thy bodily eye is too feeble to behold Me thus; the divine eye I give thee. Behold Me thus in My wondrous Power as LORD.”

9 As He thus spake, Hari, the great God of wondrous Power, allowed Pārtha to see His supreme Form as that of the LORD, 10 with manifold mouths and eyes, in divers wondrous aspects, wearing many divine adornments, with many divine weapons upraised, 11 in divine garlands and robes, anointed with divine scents, His countenance facing every way; a God, all marvellous, infinite. 12 The splendour of the Supreme was as though in the heavens the splendour of a thousand suns all together should blaze out.

14 Thereat was Arjuna filled with amazement; with hair

¹ O highest Person

on end, he clasped his hands, bowed down his head, and addressed God:

17 Bearer of crown, of mace and discus, see I,
 A sea of splendour, shining all around
 On all sides, a sun-flash of colossal flame.
 A prospect I can scarce endure.

18 Without beginning, middle, end, infinite in Power,
 Numberless arms, the sun and moon Thy eyes,
 Thee I behold, with mouth of gleaming fire,
 With Thy own glow searing this Universe.

20 Spanning both Earth and Heaven—their amplitude
 Thou fillest with Thyself, in every breadth.
 Seeing Thee thus, wondrous and dread of Form,
 The triple World, O Mighty One, is filled with awe.

21 Humbly the hosts of gods draw nigh to Thee,
 In fear stand others here with folded hands.
 All Hail to Thee! cry *Siddhas*¹ and the sages,
 Hymning Thy praise, all glorious, in their songs.

22 All that's in Heaven and Earth, the clouds and winds,
 All life in air and sea, spirits and gods,
 Demons and *Siddhas*, ancients, wondrous beings,
 Thee they behold, standing in fixed amaze.

23 Colossal, many mouthed and many eyed,
 Unnumbered arms and legs, and feet and bodies,
 Bristling with horrid fangs, Thee the World sees,
 And stands, Lord, filled with horror, as do I!

24 Reaching to Heaven, in many colours glowing,
 As there Thou standest, opening wide Thy mouths,
 Thy great eyes rolling!—I am seized with terror.
 My courage fails, I am o'erwhelmed, O Vishnu.

25 Bristling with horrid fangs Thy mouths,
 Like to the flames consuming all the World.
 Where shall I flee! No shelter can I find.
 Be gracious, Lord of gods, Thou World sustainer.

¹ Demigods; cf. p. 122.

26 The sons of Dhritarāshtra
 With all their hosts of warriors of the kings,
 Bhīshma and Drona, Karna of the foe,
 And of our own force all the finest heroes,

27 In swiftest march!—Behold Thy fangs protruding!
 How terrible Thy mouths, shutting and opening!
 Heads crushed to pieces, there they are displayed,
 Pressed tight between Thy teeth, suspended there.

28 Like as the streams of water, hurried onwards,
 Flow ever rushing downwards to the Ocean,
 So stream the heroes from the world of men,
 Into Thy mouths, glowing all round with fire.

29 As moths into the fierce flame of the lamp
 Impetuously swarm, to be destroyed,
 So crowd into Thy throats, to be destroyed
 Therein, the multitudes of men.

30 For ever licking with Thy flaming mouths,
 Thou dost devour them on all sides alike.
 Thy fearful glow scorches the utmost reaches,
 Filling the Universe with flame, O Vishnu!

31 Tell me, O Thou of dreadful Form, Who art Thou!
 Never can I conceive of Thy appearing.
 I do adore Thee, Prince of gods. Be gracious!
 Fain would I understand Thee, source of all.

32 *The Supreme:*
 Kāla am I, Destroyer, great and mighty,
 Appearing here all men to sweep away.
 And, without thee, would none of all these warriors,
 Here in their ranks arrayed, ever remain.

33 Therefore arise, win glory, smite the foe,
 Enjoy thy lordship in prosperity.
 By Me alone have they long since been routed,
 BE THOU NOUGHT BUT MY TOOL, thou dexterous one.

34 Drona and Bhīshma too, and Jayadratha,

And Karna with the others strong in battle,
By Me already slain, slay thou. Be void of fear,
Thine enemies thou shalt vanquish.—Fight thou on.

35 *Samjaya:*

Hearing Keśava's words, trembling and shuddering,
Clasping his hands, and humbly worshipping,
The bearer of the crown thus spake to Krishna,
Stammering and fearful, bowing down to Him.

36 *Arjuna:*

Rightly, O Hrishīkeśa, at Thy praises
The Universe is gladdened and rejoices.
Demons in terror seek the farthest spaces,
While hosts of *Siddhas* to Thee do obeisance.

41 Howe'er unseemly Thee I may have hailed
As comrade:—"O Krishna! Yādava, O Friend!"
Heedless expressions, or e'en too familiar,
Forgetful of this Majesty of Thine,

42 Whate'er in jest I have spoken with irreverence,
Wand'ring or resting, sitting down or eating,
Alone with Thee, or in another's presence,
For that I crave Thee pardon, boundless One.

43 Father art Thou of all that moves, or moves not,
Most ven'rable, the World's reverèd *Guru*,¹
None is like Thee, much less is there a greater!
In the three Worlds Thy Power hath no equal

44 Therefore I bow, casting myself to earth,
I would appease Thee, Lord, and worship Thee.
As fathers sons, friends, friends, and as do lovers
To those they love, O God, deign Thou to pardon.

45 Rejoiced to see what ne'er hath yet been seen,
Still is my mind with fear quite overwhelmed.
Show me again, O God, Thine ancient Form.
Be gracious to me, Lord of gods, World Orderer.

46 Wearing the diadem, holding mace and discus,
 As erst Thou wert, may I again behold Thee.
 That Form, four-armed One, manifest anew,
 O thousand-armed, O Figure universal.

47 *The Supreme:*

Gracious to thee, have I this highest Form
 Shown thee, Arjuna, through My wondrous Power,
 Flaming and infinite, primeval, universal,
 Except by thee ne'er seen before by any.

48 By *Vedas*, sacrifice, study or gift of alms,
 By ritual, or e'en by gruesome penance,
 No one save thee, in all this world of men,
 Can see Me in this Form, O best of *Kurus*!

49 Be not distressed, be not thyself bewildered,
 At thus this awful Form of Mine beholding.
 From fear released, with joyful mind, behold Me
 Again, and in that Form beheld aforetime.

50 *Samjaya:*

Thus to Arjuna, “Yea”, spake Vāsudeva,
 And showed Himself anew in ancient Form.
 So the Supreme consoled the terror stricken,
 In friendly aspect once again returned.

51 *Arjuna:*

Now that I see Thee again in friendly human form, O
 Janārdana, I have once more returned to my natural state of
 mind, and come to my senses again.

XVIII

58 *The Supreme:*

Therefore direct thy *thoughts* to Me; then through My
 grace thou shalt surmount all difficulties. But if, from arro-
 gance, thou wilt not obey, thou shalt perish. 59 If (now),

in thy self-sufficiency, thou thinkest that thou wilt not fight, this thy resolve is (also) vain: thy (martial) nature will constrain thee so to do. 60 For bound by the Power of Destiny, assigned to thee with thy nature, thou wilt do compulsorily what now through bewilderment thou dost not wish to do. 61 (But this compelling power of thine own nature is nothing other than the operation of the Universal Activity; for) this God abides in the heart of all beings and makes them move like puppets on the stage by His magic Power. . . .

. . . 66 Fret not thyself, therefore, because of all the “laws”. (In thy “sorrow”) take thy refuge in Me alone. I will free thee from all “sins”. Abandon thy “sorrow”. . . .

. . . 72 Hast thou heard this, O Pārtha, with attentive mind? Has thy perplexity disappeared, that sprang from ignorance?

73 *Arjuna:*

The perplexity has disappeared. By Thy grace, O Acyuta, I have gained prudence. I stand steadfast, freed from doubt. I will fulfil Thy command.

CHAPTER II

ŚRĪMAD-BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ

THE SONG OF THE SUPREME EXALTED ONE

I

[THE DESPONDENCY OF ARJUNA]

*1 Dhritarāshtra.*¹

Assembled on the sacred field, the Kuru field,² eager for battle, what did my people and the Pāndavas do, O Samjaya?

*2 Samjaya.*³

Duryodhana,⁴ the King, saw the army of the Pāndavas,⁵ drawn up in battle-line. He approached his teacher (Drona⁶) and spoke to him these words:

3 "Behold, O Teacher, this mighty host of the sons of Pāndu, drawn up in battle array by the son of Drupada, thy wise disciple. 4 There are heroes, great archers, equal in fight to Bhīma and Arjuna,⁷ Yuyudhāna, Virāta, and Drupada the great warrior charioteer, 5 Drishtraketu, Cekitāna, and the valiant⁸ King of the Kāśis; also Purujit, Kuntibhoja, and the Prince of the Śibis, the hero, 6 Yudhāmanyu the

¹ The blind old King of the Kauravas, and father of King Duryodhana.

² A plain near Delhi.

³ Samjaya (Siegfried) has, in some miraculous way, been present at the battle, and now narrates it to the blind King.

⁴ "The Unconquerable."

⁵ The opponents of the Kauravas, led by their King Yudhishthira.

⁶ [He was teacher to both the Kurus and the Pāndus, who had been brought up together at the Kuru court.]

⁷ Yudhishthira's brothers, Bhīma is Yudhishthira's Commander-in-Chief, while Arjuna, the friend of Krishna, is the great hero of the Pāndavas.

⁸ *vīryavān.*

brave and Uttamaujas the valiant, Saubhadrā's son and the sons of Draupadi,¹ all great warrior charioteers.

7 But know those that are the chief of *our* side, the leaders of *my* army. So that thou mayest know them, I will name them to thee: 8 Thyself (Drona), then Bhishma,² Karna, Kripa, victorious in battle, Aśvatthāman and Vikarna and Somadatta's son, 9 and many other heroes, ready to renounce their lives for me. With divers kinds of weapons they are all skilled in fighting, 10 and yet this force of ours, though led by the (well-experienced) Bhishma himself, is insufficient, while their force, led by Bhima, is sufficient (for victory)."³

11 (*Addressed to the bystanders*): "So all ye therefore, arrayed in your respective ranks, heed my command that ye give Bhishma special⁴ protection."

12 (When Bhishma heard this), in order to give Duryodhana courage the glorious Kuru elder⁵ sounded the war cry, mighty as the lion's roar, and blew his conch, 13 and straightway the conchs, the kettledrums, drums, tabors, and the "cow-mouths"⁶ (of the other leaders) sounded deeply forth; there was a wild uproar. 14 And straightway too, (from the Pāndavas' ranks) Mādhava (Krishna) and the son of Pāndu (Arjuna), standing side by side in their mighty war chariot yoked with white steeds, blew their magnificent conchs.⁷ 15 Hrishīkeśa (Krishna) blew his Pañcajanya,⁸ the treasure gainer (Arjuna) his Devadatta⁹ horn, Vrikodara of terrible

¹ The five Pāndavas.

² Duryodhana's Commander-in-Chief.

³ Duryodhana is most anxious about the issue of the battle.

⁴ Note *eva* here. Bhishma, as the champion who is directing the battle, moves from place to place, but wherever he is, whoever finds himself where Bhishma himself is standing must keep his safety in mind.

⁵ Bhishma is Duryodhana's great-uncle.

⁶ Trumpets.

⁷ [In the next verse Mādhava is called Hrishīkeśa], while Arjuna retains his own name. [Vrikodara (wolf-bellied) is an epithet of Bhima.]

⁸ Made from the bones of a demon, Pañcajana.

⁹ Bestowed, that is, by the *deva* Indra.

deeds the mighty horn Paundra. 16 The King himself, Yudhishthira, son of Kuntī, blew Anantavijaya,¹ Nakula and Sahadeva, (his brothers), Sughoṣha and Manipushpaka,² 17 and likewise, far around, the Prince of the Kāśis, finest of archers, and Śikandhin the warrior charioteer, Dhṛishtadyumna and Virāta, Sātyaki the unconquered, 18 Drupada and the sons of Draupadī and the son of Saubhadrā, the mighty armed, severally blew their conchs. 19 So wild was the uproar that, resounding through Heaven and Earth, it rent the hearts of the sons of Dhṛitarāshtra.

20 And even as the arrows began to fly the son of Pāndu (Arjuna), whose crest was an ape, seized his bow, gazed (contemplatively) at the sons of Dhṛitarāshtra, 21 and then spoke to Hṛishīkeśa:³

Arjuna:

Here, between the two armies, stay my chariot, O Acyuta,⁴ 22 so that I may behold them standing, eager for the fray. What kind of men shall I have to face in this hard battle? 23 I would ponder and examine who these warriors are, gathered here to please the evil minded Duryodhana.

24 *Samjaya:*

Hṛishīkeśa, thus addressed by Gudākeśa,⁵ straightway stayed the best of chariots between the two armies, 25 in the face of Bhīṣma, Drona and all the other princes (of the foe), and said: "Behold these assembled Kurus". 26 And Pārtha⁶ saw standing there fathers and grandfathers, teachers, uncles, brothers, sons, grandsons and companions, 27 fathers-

¹ "Of endless victory."

² "Loudly resounding and adorned with pearls."

³ Krishna's name, it may mean "curly haired".

⁴ Another of Krishna's names, meaning "The Immovable".

⁵ Arjuna's name—"The thick haired", possibly, or [having the hair in a ball].

⁶ The son of Prithī—a designation of Arjuna.

in-law and friends in both armies. Beholding all these kinsmen arrayed, 28 he was moved with deepest pity, Tremblingly he spoke:

Arjuna:

As I see these my own people, (on this side and on that), arrayed eager for battle, 29 my limbs fail. My mouth is parched. Trembling comes upon my body and my hair stands on end. 30 Gāndiva¹ slips from my hand, my skin burns all over. Hardly can I stand, and my mind is in a whirl. 31 I see adverse signs, O Keśava,² nor do I find any advantage if I slay those who are my own people in battle. 32 I wish not for victory, nor lordship nor pleasures (of conquest). For what is lordship to us? what are enjoyments or life itself?³ 33 They for whose sake we desire lordship, enjoyments and pleasures, stand here in battle, abandoning wealth and life: 34 teachers and fathers and sons and grandfathers, fathers-in-law, grandsons, brothers-in-law and other kinsfolk. 35 Them I wish not to slay, though slain myself—not for lordship over the three Worlds, much less for mere lordship over the Earth. 36 In laying low the sons of Dhritarāshtra, what delight would be ours? Nought but sin would overtake us as archcriminals, were we to slay these. 37 We dare not slay those who are our own kinsfolk. For if we slay our own kin, how should we ourselves ever be happy? 38 Even if they, blinded by greed, see no wrong in destroying kin, nor crime in betraying friends, 39 —how should we, who see the wrong, not know how to turn away from that sin (being endowed with insight)? 40 When kin are destroyed the ancient and sacred kin laws themselves perish. But when the law is destroyed, lawlessness overcomes the whole kin. 41 Consequently the kins-women⁴ are corrupted. But when the women are corrupted, straightway there arises confusion of caste. 42 But this

¹ [His bow]

² Krishna's epithet, [having fine hair]

³ If, that is to say, they are bought at such a price.

⁴ They were the guardians of the ancient sacred customs.

must lead the destroyers of kin, and likewise the kin itself, to Hell, and the ancestors¹ of the kin, because they are deprived of gifts to ancestors, plunge downwards (from the celestial *pitri-loka*).² 43 Thus through these sins of the kin destroyers, that cause confusion of caste, both the primeval caste laws and the kin laws are ruined. 44 But the abode ordained for men who have no kin laws is ever in Hell, as the sacred precepts teach us. 45 Alas! a great sin we have resolved to commit, in that out of greed for the pleasures of lordship, we are prepared to slay our own people. 46 Rather may the sons of Dhritarāshtra with weapons in hand slay me, unresisting and weaponless, in the battle (than that I should burden myself with such sin).

47 Samjaya:

Thus, pending the battle, Arjuna spoke and dropped his bow and arrows and, his mind shaken with grief, sank down on the chariot seat.

II

[SĀNKHYA]

1 To him, moved by pity, his eyes filled by tears and grief, despondent, Madhusūdana³ spoke thus:

2 The Supreme:

Whence in this strait⁴ has come upon thee this baseness, unseemly in the noble, excluding from Heaven,⁵ and causing disgrace, O Arjuna?

¹ [To whom sacrifices for their welfare are due.]

² The world of the Fathers.

³ An epithet of Krishna, [slayer of the demon Madhu].

⁴ That is just at the critical moment.

⁵ For the warrior, courage in battle is the pathway to the Heaven of Indra.

3 Yield not to such unmanliness: that befits thee not.
Abandon such base weakness of heart. Stand up, O Oppressor
of the enemy!

4 *Arjuna:*

How shall I fight in battle with arrows against Bhishma,
against Drona, both of whom deserve all veneration from me?

5 Much better is it to eat the common food of beggars here,
So as to be free from sin against such worthy teachers!
Even though they are filled with desire for gain—to slay
them

Would besmear all pleasure as with blood.

6 And who can say which is the more to be desired:

For us to conquer them or for them to conquer us?
For without them we ourselves should not wish to live,
Even the sons of Dhritarāshtra arrayed before us.

7 Perplexity has evilly befallen me,

My sense of right and wrong is confused.

I ask Thee, tell me with certainty, which now would be
better.

I am Thy disciple. Teach me: to Thee I flee.

8 Even if I should attain prosperous and secure lordship on
Earth, or even sovereignty among the gods,

I see not what would drive away the sorrow that dries up
the power of my senses.

9 *Samjaya:*

Thus Gudākeśa addressed Hrishīkeśa. “*I will not fight*”
—said he once more to Govinda. Then he became silent.

10 Then Krishna, with (a gracious) smile, spoke to the
despondent one between the two armies these words.

11 *The Supreme:*

Thou utterest wise things¹—and yet thou sorrowest for whom

¹ [According to Ānandagiri this refers to Arjuna's words in I, 43, about the sin of destroying families. The Kashmir recension has,

thou shouldst not sorrow. Whether vitality has vanished or not—for that the wise grieve not. 12¹ Never at any time was I not, nor thou, nor these lords of men. Nor shall any of us ever cease to be hereafter. 13 For as in this his actual body (one and the same) dweller therein² passes successively through the conditions of childhood, manhood and age (without losing his identity), even so is it with the acquisition of yet another body.³ The intelligent man is not confused (by the bodily change).⁴

(*A Sāṅkhya Gloss*):

14 But contacts with the *mātrās*⁵ [the things of sense] which cause the sensations of cold and heat, of pleasure and pain,⁶ are incessantly coming and going and without permanence; endure them in patience. 15 For he whom these distress not, but who confronts with equanimity weal and woe alike, is wise and fit for immortality. 16 The Unreal has no existence, non-existence pertains to the Unreal: philosophers⁷ know of such distinctions between the existent and the non-existent. 17 Know

“thou dost not speak as an intelligent man”; but this, as Dr. Barnett points out, may be an explanation to remove a supposed contradiction.]

¹ Verses 12 and 13 state the *theme*, which is then explicitly substantiated by the ancient words of wisdom in the following three *trishtubh* strophes (of eleven syllables) 20, 22, 29. All else is intrusive accessory material.

² This is the “spiritual subject”—the “self” or “individual”—who *possesses* its body, but is not identical with it: the *adhyātman* or “true” self. In v. 12 these spiritual subjects are conceived as forming an actual plurality.

³ Which is acquired, that is to say, by one and the same imperishably identical spiritual subject.

⁴ As regards the permanence of the subject himself.

⁵ These are the elementary qualities of Sound, Tangibility, Colour, Taste and Smell.

⁶ These are the contrasting “Pairs”; and in what follows “Pairs” is the term that is frequently used in this connection.

⁷ The *tattvaridas*, who are those who know and enumerate the various “thatnesses”—elements or qualities (*tattvas*); they are *sāṅkhyas*—“philosophers” in the proper sense of this term; cf. p. 57, n. 3.

that¹ as indestructible, (because it exists), by which this (material) All is permeated²; no one can work the destruction of this changeless One. 18 "Finite" are called only the (successive) bodies of the self-embodied (spiritual Being), but this (self-embodied Spirit) is eternal, indestructible, immeasurable (in its duration).—Therefore fight, O Bhārata 19 (For) whoever regards this as itself the slayer, or as that which is slain, both of them understand not: it slays not nor is it slain.

20 It is born not, nor does it ever die.

Nor shall it, after having been *brought into being*, hereafter come not to be.

Permanent, eternal, ancient, unborn,
This dies not, even when the body perishes.

(Continuation of the Gloss):—

21 He that knows it to be indestructible, eternal, unborn, changeless, how can that man, and whom, can he slay or cause to be slain!

22 As a man casts off old clothes,
In order to put on, instead, other new ones,
So the embodied one casts away the worn-out bodies
And puts on new garb.

(Continuation of the Gloss):—

23 Weapons cleave it not, fire burns it not, water wets it not, wind dries it not. 24 Uncleavable it is, it cannot be burnt, it cannot be wetted, and it cannot be dried. Permanent, all-pervading,³ stable and immovable, it is eternal. 25 Unmanifested, inconceivable, unchanging it is called. Therefore knowing it to be such, thou shouldst not sorrow over it. 26 And even shouldst thou think of it as continually born, and continually dying, even so thou shouldst not sorrow over it. 27 (For in

¹ The *ātma-tattvam*, that is, in its qualitative unity and equality, but in its numerical plurality, according to Rāmānuja; cf. p 281.

² [“Created”—*talām*: the word means “stretched on a loom, woven”, and is due to the Vedic conception of the universe as the warp and woof of a loom. Śankara, followed by modern commentators, says *vyāpiam*, “enveloped”.]

³ Permeating merely the whole body? or omnipresent? According to *Sāṅkhya*, each of the countless *purushas* (persons or selves) is all-pervading.

that case it is surely true,) for him that is born death is certain, and certain is birth for him that is dead: over the unavoidable thou shouldst not sorrow. 28 (Again) Unmanifest are creatures in their beginning, and unmanifest in their ending, only their state between beginning and end is manifest. What is there here for lamentation?

29 As marvellous one man looks upon it,
Likewise as marvellous another speaks of it,
And as marvellous another hears of it.

But not one—even when he has heard of it—knows it.¹

30 (Therefore), O Arjuna, this embodied one itself in the body of everyone is ever invulnerable. Therefore for no creature shouldst thou sorrow (believing that it can annihilate itself).

31 But equally little shouldst thou tremble, when thou seekest thy own *duty*. For there is nought better to a warrior than righteous war. 32 With joy warriors take up such a fight, offered freely to them (from no fault of their own), as the open door of Heaven. 33 Shouldst thou refuse to undertake this righteous warfare, then thou wilt cast away thy own duty (over which thou art sorrowing), and also thy good name, and fall into sin. 34 And (with justice) people will speak of thy undying dishonour. And to an honourable man dis-honour is worse than death. 35 The warrior charioteers will think that thou hast held back from battle through fear. Thou wilt fall into contempt, even among those who honoured thee; 36 while they that have ill will to thee will say things of thee that cannot be gainsaid, mocking thy warlike valour. What is there worse than that for a warrior? 37 Either thou wilt fall and attain Heaven, or thou wilt conquer and gain the Earth. Therefore arise, O son of Kuntī, resolved on war.²

¹ Here there are echoes of *The Katha Upanishad*, I, 2, 7.—Sankara expands the last line as follows.—“Even when one has beheld and heard and proclaimed it—no one has understood it”. No doubt he is correct.

² These are obvious martial terms that evidently culminate in

(*A Gloss*):

38 Holding equal pleasure and pain, gain and loss, victory and defeat, gird thyself (with equanimity) for the fight, so shalt thou not fall into sin.¹

(*The Original Gītā is resumed in Chapter X, 1 ff.*)

(TREATISE VII—II. 39-IV. 42. *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, together with *Sāṅkhya*, incorporated in the Krishna cult.)²

(1). 39 The wisdom³ (hitherto) expounded to thee is founded on *Sāṅkhya*; but now hear what follows, founded on *Yoga*. Armed with this, O Pārtha, thou shalt cast off the bond of *Karman* [action]. 40 There is here neither loss of the advance (already won, to the goal), nor retreat (on the road already traversed),⁴ and even a little (observance) of this (*Karma-Yoga*-)dharma [righteousness] saves from the

v. 37, v. 38, on the other hand, halts most pitifully. The philosopher, who has previously interpolated his Glosses, here attaches his own scholastic doctrine to these simple chivalrous words. His admonition is, however, altogether superfluous, since Arjuna had unfortunately been only too indifferent to pleasure and pain, to success or failure, victory or defeat, and this is precisely what Krishna had wished to banish from his mind by the appeal to Arjuna's chivalrous sentiments. But at the same time the interpolator, who is simultaneously a *sāṅkhya* and a *yogin*, intends this Gloss to constitute the transition to the doctrinal Treatise on *Yoga* which he inserts here.

¹ But it was not apathy towards pleasure or pain, to gain or loss, that Krishna had intended to arouse, on the contrary, he had appealed to the *painful sensibility* to shame, and to the *gain* of Heaven and of earthly sovereignty.

² *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* is *Yoga* associated with īśvara, the Lord, or with God, cf. p. 130. On the construction of this Treatise, cf. p. 227, and on the subdivisions i., ii. . . . refer to the Analysis, p. 229.

³ [“Thought”: the word here translated “thought” is *buddhi*. It is the teaching concerning action which has just been given. Later, when the word is used in a technical sense as one of the evolutes of Nature, and as the mental function to be trained by *Yoga*, it is translated “intellect”]; cf. further p. 237

⁴ Because “firm resolve” is the foundation of *Yoga*. This forms the characteristic distinction from *Sāṅkhya* which, owing to its intellectual aspect, does not adequately recognize this volitional factor of *Yoga*; cf. further pp. 117.

great fear (of return to *Samsāra*).¹ 41 The mood of him who observes this *dharma* is unified and composed, because it is settled by *firm resolve*, while the mood of the irresolute is most diversified, endlessly wandering to and fro. 42-44 By firm resolve their mood cannot (be fixed and) brought to inner collectedness, who pursue nought higher than enjoyments, lordship and aims like these, since they are bereft of reason by flowery speech,² which is concerned with nothing but uninterrupted rebirth (in endless *Samsāra*)³ as the fruit of *Veda*-actions, and is filled with a thousand kinds of cult and ritual practices for attaining enjoyments, lordship, and aims such as these. Traditionalists declaim this (flowery speech and) the doctrine of the *Vedas* affirms this folly: "There is nought (but the world of *Samsāra* and its enjoyments)." Inordinate desire is of their very being and they strive only for the heavenly spheres (of the *Vedas*). 45 For verily the *Vedas* strive only for this world (of sensuous things),⁴ composed of the three *gunas*.⁵ But do thou, O Arjuna, become free from the world of the three *gunas*, free from the "pairs", abiding ever steadfast in thy being, indifferent to possessions and their preservation, lord of thyself. 46 Whatever advantage (a skilful husbandman) can derive from his reservoir, filled to its brim with water flowing in from all sides, the same advantage the learned brahman understands how to obtain from all his *Vedas*:⁶

¹ (Rebirth). Precisely because there is here no "retreat".

² The priestly wisdom associated with the eudemonicistic Vedic cult activities. ³ With no way out from *Samsāra*.

⁴ To which the celestial worlds of the *devas* (gods) also belong.

⁵ The "constituents of Nature", or "the strands" (Hill). [The *Vedas* deal with the objects of the world of sense, ritual and sacrifice, not with the means of winning final release. The pairs of opposites are pleasure and pain, desire and aversion, etc.] On the *gunas*, cf. further VII. 12 ff., XIV. 5 ff., XVII. 1 ff., XVIII. 4 ff.

⁶ [Meaning that the *Vedas* may have many uses for one who knows how to apply them, though not for attaining the highest end; but it has also been taken in the sense that where there is much water a tank is of no use at all]; cf. p. 283.

47 but as for thee, never concern thyself with the *profit* of thy actions, but only with the work itself that must be done. The motive for thy action should never be the fruit of thy works. Nevertheless, be not attached to complete abstention from action.

(ii): 48 (On the contrary), do thy works, free from attachment (to actions and their fruits), with steadfast inner composure,¹ indifferent to success or failure, verily, *Yoga*, (or inner composure), is equanimity.

49 (Ultimately, all depends on this inner mood of equanimity, since) action² has far less value than the cultivation of (this) mood itself (*buddhi*).³ Take thy refuge in this mood (of equanimity), for wretched are they whose motive is the fruit of works.⁴ 50 He who has cultivated this mood abandons, even in this life, good and evil deeds alike. Therefore arm thyself with *Yoga*. *Yoga* gives *skill* with regard to actions.⁵ 51 For the wise who, thus armed in spirit, concern themselves not with the fruit produced by action, are released from the bonds of rebirth and go to the abode *free from sickness*. 52 When thy mood, (being thus firmly disposed), shall pass beyond the tangle of (worldly) bewilderment, thou wilt be nauseated by all (Vedic) tradition; 53 and when, reacting against tradition, thy capacity for insight and power of resolution (*buddhi*) shall immovably stand in steadfast composure, then shalt thou attain to *Yoga* (and its goal).⁶

¹ *yogasthah*

² [This, as Śankara says, and as the last words of the verse show, is ordinary action done for the sake of the fruit, the *Yoga* is the training of the intellect so as to act without desire for the fruit]

³ On this term, cf. p. 237

⁴ Pitiable and wretched, because they do not attain the inner freedom and spiritual superiority of the *yogin*, owing to being bound by interests

⁵ But cf. Note, p. 283.

⁶ That is freedom from the power of *Karman* and from *Samsāra*.

(III): 54 *Arjuna:*

What is characteristic of him who has attained this firmly founded wisdom,¹ and stands inwardly composed? How will one of such steadfast mood speak? How will he sit and move?

55 *The Supreme Exalted One:*

He is called one of firmly founded wisdom who abandons all the desires that crowd into his heart, and is satisfied in the (inner) self by the self alone.² 56 He is called one of steadfast mood and (likewise) a silent recluse,³ who grieves not over pain and is not concerned with pleasure, from whom desire, fear and anger have departed. 57 Firmly founded is his wisdom who, free from inclination to aught, whatsoever it may be, cherishes neither affection nor aversion, no matter whether good or ill befall him. 58 Firmly founded is his wisdom who, like a tortoise withdrawing its limbs, withdraws his senses on every side and avoids the objects of sense. 59 When an embodied one abstains from food he retains its pleasure (to some degree, and the desire for it), even though the pleasureable objects themselves vanish in this way. But when he sees the highest,⁴ pleasure and desire alike vanish.

(IV): 60 The senses are disturbing; violently they deprive

¹ Here *prajñā* is not theoretical insight like that possessed by the *sāṅkhyā*, but *sapientia* in the sense of wise conduct, and hence synonymous with *buddhi*, which has just been described as consisting in force of resolution in accordance with conviction. hence “firmly founded” wisdom; *prajñā* itself, in fact, also means *resolution*, and perhaps a better translation here would be “firmly founded resolution”; cf. *vyavasāya*. For *bhāshā* Davies gives “distinguishing mark”.

² Not, that is, owing to the capacity for sensuous and intellectual apperception, but immediately through the self.

³ *Muni*. This is the reply to Arjuna’s enquiry how a man of this sort *speaks*—so far as is at all possible, he never does so.

⁴ The spiritual self, within the body that it possesses.

of reason even the wise man who is striving. 61 He must bind them with his reason and, intent on this,¹ persevere in strenuous self-control. For firmly founded is his wisdom who exerts authority over his senses.

(v): 62 If a man meditates on the objects [of sense], interest in them arises; from interest desire is born; from desire² anger is produced. 63 Through anger comes bewilderment; through bewilderment the wavering of prudence,³ the loss of prudence entails injury to the capacity for judgment and the power of resolution. And this is spiritual destruction. 64 (On the contrary), he who, master of himself, draws near the objects [of sense], with his senses free from inclination and aversion and under the firm control of the self, attains to "serenity".⁴ 65 In this serenity he gains release from all evil, because his force of resolution, who is thus serene, is forthwith strengthened.⁵ 66 But not so for one untrained (through *Yoga*); neither can he attain a developed personality, while without such personality there is for him no true peace of soul. And how can good befall him who lacks this?

67 As the wind drives a ship on the waters, so is his wisdom carried away whose mind follows after the roving senses. 68 Therefore only his "wisdom will be firmly

¹ According to Otto Schrader's *The Kashmir Recension of The Bhagavadgita* (referred to as K), and to Rāmakantha, (cf. Schrader, p. 26) The *matpara* of the Vulgate is to be easily explained as a later correction of the original *tatpava*, though the converse is impossible. There is no reference whatever to Īśvara in the entire context, while the *Text* of K and of Rāmakantha also is in complete conformity with the tone of the pure Equanimity-*Yoga* depicted here.

² When it remains unsatisfied, and because it cannot be satisfied.

³ Or errors of memory

⁴ This is a technical term, equivalent to spiritual *atarava*, or to absolute *ησυχία*.

⁵ This has previously been referred to as "inner superiority, cf. II. 34, "honour" and "dishonour"; also II. 45, and Note 1, p. 46. .

founded" who strenuously withholds his senses on all sides from the objects [of sense], (as it is said).

69 "In the night of other beings, he who is self-controlled is awake.

And when they awake, that is night for the *muni* [recluse], who sees (the truth)."

(Or again):

70 "As waters fall into the ocean,

Without ever filling it, and without agitating it,
So he into whom desires flow, leaving no traces,
Attains to peace, and not the pleasure seeker."

71 (This teaches that) he who forsakes all desires, and moves devoid of all aspiration, without seeking "mine", or self, attains to peace.

72 This state is the "*Brahma*" state. Whoever attains this is released from illusion. And he who at the hour of death abides in it enters the *Nirvāna* of *Brahma*.

III

[ACTION]

(vi): 1 *Arjuna*:

*Buddhi*¹ [Intellect] is deemed by Thee to be more excellent than action. Why then dost Thou impose on me action that is so terrible? 2 Meseems that with perplexing speech Thou bewilderest my judgment. Tell me therefore clearly the one thing whereby I may attain the better course.

3 *The Supreme*:

I have told thee before that there are two kinds of

¹ This has previously been defined as "firmly founded wisdom", shown in the deliberate renunciation of the objects of sense and the things of the world. But if this is all that matters, then the question at once arises whether there is any meaning in acting at all.

(righteous) "practice" pursued by mankind—that of the *sāṅkhyas* as the practice of knowledge and that of the *yogins* as the practice of action. 4 (But the practice of exoteric *Sannyāsa* [Renunciation] is wrong, since) by merely refusing to undertake action man attains no release from the bonds of *Karman*, nor by mere renunciation of action does he win perfection. 5 For no one ever, even for one moment, (really) remains without doing action, since quite involuntarily everyone is made to do action (every moment) by the *gunas* arising from Nature, 6 and he who strenuously controls his (five) organs of action, yet at the same time reflects in his mind on the objects of the senses (and desires them) is wholly in error and the victim of illusion.

7 But he who restrains his senses by his mind, and by means of his organs of action pursues the practice of work, being unattached to action and its fruit, excels. 8 Therefore do thou the action that is necessary. Action is better than non-action. Even the maintenance of thy body would not be achieved if thou didst not act.

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

(a)¹: 9 Except for the action done for the sake of sacrifice, all action "binds" this world (to *Samsāra*). For the sake of that do thou action, yet free from attachment. 10 The creator Prajāpati² aforetime created human beings along with sacrifice and spake to them: "By virtue of the sacrifice ye shall propagate, the sacrifice shall be your cow of desires.³ 11 With this nourish ye the gods; in return for this, may the gods nourish you. Thus mutually nourishing each other, ye will attain all well-being. 12 For the gods, nourished by your sacrifice, shall grant you your wished-for blessings. But he who enjoys the blessings granted by them, and does not himself on his own part offer to them, is verily a thief"

¹ α and β refer to p. 285.

² [The creator in Vedic mythology]

³ [A mythical cow of Indra, from which everything desired could be had; see x. 28.]

13 Therefore excellent are they who eat their food only as the remains of the sacrifice: they shall be freed from all sins. Wicked are they who cook only for themselves; they eat sin.

(β): 14 From food beings arise, from rain food is produced, from the sacrifice arises rain, and the sacrifice is produced by (ritual) action, 15 (ritual) action from (*Sabda*-) *Brahman*¹ (the *Vedas*), (*Sabda*-) *Brahman* from *Akshara-Brahman* [the imperishable] Therefore *Brahman* itself, that is so far as it is "all pervading", rests always on the sacrifice 16 Thus turns the *Brahman* wheel, and the life of him who turns not with this is sin, he is a slave of the senses and his life is vain.² 17 But the man who rejoices in the *ātman*³ alone, who is satisfied in the *ātman* itself, and who is content in the *ātman* alone, for him there is *nought* remaining to be done. 18 For him there is no longer meaning in what is "done" or "not done", and all things concern him no more

19 Therefore without attachment ever perform action that should be done; whoso does this attains the supreme (goal). 20 Verily by action Janaka⁴ and others (the great ones of old time) achieved the realization of the goal.⁵— Thou shouldst act solely so as to maintain order among the people (by thy example).⁶ 21 For as he of superior rank behaves, so too do other people, whatever he sets before them, people imitate. 22 (Look towards Myself): there is *nought* that must be done by Me (of Myself) in all three worlds; there is *nought* that I have not achieved, so that I must strive therefor. Yet I engage in action. 23 For verily if I did not engage in action unweariedly, then would mankind, likewise, everywhere follow My track. 24 (This

¹ [Here in the Vedic sense of prayer or magical formula, especially the *mantras* of the *Vedas* used in the sacrifice; cf. *Vedic Hymns*, pp. 21, 125. In iv. 24, where it is explained that any action may be a sacrifice, Brahma is the Supreme. For *Brahmā* the god, see Note on viii. 3.]

² Since it leads to nothing good.

³ The self.

⁴ [King of Mithilā and father of Sītā, the wife of Rāma.]

⁵ *samsiddhim āstihita*: in terms of primitive Yoga, "they have become *divyasyiddhas*"; cf. p. 124, n. 3.

⁶ As beseems thee, in belonging to the ruling class.

means that) these worlds would fall into ruin if I did not perform action, I should cause universal confusion, and verily I should destroy these creatures.

25 The unwise perform action, being attached to action: the wise too should *act* as they do, only without attachment, and (solely) with the view to maintaining order among the people. 26 No one therefore should impair the convictions of those who, (in their naivety), are attached to action, the (multitude) who lack the higher insight. The learned man approves of all works such as he himself executes, but as a *yogin*. 27 (In truth) actions are produced wholly by the *gunas* of Nature. Only he who, under the delusion of the transference (of Nature's activity), concentrates on the *ego*, imagines that "I myself am the doer". 28 But he who knows the actual conditions, regarding the distinction (between himself) and *gunas* and action, thinks: "gunas function in relation to *gunas*",¹ and is thereby free from attachment. 29 Those who are bewildered by the *gunas* of Nature are attached to the actions, which nevertheless are effected only by the *gunas* themselves. Let not him who knows the whole truth impair the convictions of the simple-minded, who know only half the truth. 30 So fight therefore, with thy thought concentrated on the true self within thee, without desire, without self-interest, without excitement, abandoning all actions to Me. 31 He also, who ever follows this My teaching, full of faith and with no opposition, is released from his actions.² 32 But know thou that he who opposes this My teaching, and follows it not, is a man completely bewildered in knowledge, unreasonable and lost.

33 The man of knowledge too is active in accordance with

¹ The apparent actor-subject, originating from the combinations of the *gunas*, affects objects which consist of such combinations themselves, cf. Hill's Note.

² Or in other words: they no longer fetter him to *Samsāra*, as *all* actions would do otherwise.

his nature. All beings follow Nature, and compulsion can effect nothing (against one's own nature).¹

34 Inclination and aversion are related to the object of each sense. One should guard against falling into the power of these two (motives), for they constantly lie in wait for him in the way. 35 It is better to fulfil one's own duty, even though inadequately performed, than another's duty, even though well done. Better is destruction in fulfilling one's own duty than the gain of happiness in the fulfilment of duty not one's own.²

(vii): 36 *Arjuna:*

Then by what is the man urged on that he commits evil, even without wishing it, as though constrained by force?

37 *The Supreme:*

It is desire, it is anger, produced by the *rajas-guna* [the constituent of passion], an archdevourer, a vile scoundrel. Know that in this world that is the enemy. 38 As a flame enveloped in smoke, as a mirror by dirt, as the embryo by the womb, so is this (knowledge) by that³ (doubly vile scoundrel). 39 This eternal enemy of the knower, which takes at will now this form and now that and is like an insatiable flame, envelops the knowledge of the knower. 40 In the senses, the mind and the intellect it takes up its station (disturbing them), and with these (after disturbing them) it bewilders the embodied one, enveloping his knowledge. 41 Therefore first restraining thy senses, do thou expel this vile scoundrel, that destroys knowledge and understanding. 42 "The senses are the highest"—this they say. (Yet) higher than the senses is the mind, higher than the mind is the intellect, but higher than the intellect is *he*, (the spiritual subject itself). 43 Thus deeming (the

¹ *furca si expellis naturam, tamen usque recurrit.*

² With K.

³ "This"—in other terms knowledge (*jñāna*)—is "enveloped" by the "enemy", as v. 39 proceeds to show.

self) as higher than (sense, mind and) intellect, and establishing the self by the self,¹ slay thou this enemy which is as hard to grasp as Proteus.

IV

[KNOWLEDGE]

(VIII): 1 The Supreme:

To Vivasvat I proclaimed this changeless *Yoga* doctrine aforetime, Vivasvat declared it to Manu, Manu to Ikshvāku.² So receiving the doctrine in succession the royal sages came to know it. But through the lapse of long time it has been lost from among them. 3 To-day I have proclaimed (anew) to thee even this ancient *Yoga* doctrine, because thou art My devoted one and friend. (Not to everyone would I declare it), for this is a supreme secret.

4 Arjuna:

How am I to understand that Thou didst proclaim this in the beginning? For Thy birth was after, the birth of Vivasvat was before.

5 The Supreme Exalted One:

Many are My previous births, and thine own also, O Arjuna. I know them all, but thou knowest them not. 6 Though I am unborn and unchanging, though I am the Lord of creatures, I am born (in different incarnations) by My own miraculous Power and as Lord of My own Nature.³

¹ The "independent", that is to say the self, which supports itself on nothing else, has its own support purely in itself alone

² [These are ancestors in the solar line of kings. Vivasvat is the sun himself.]

³ All other creatures come into bodily existence through the power of *Karman*, and are subjected to Nature. But God creates for Himself a body by His free miraculous Power, and as Lord over Nature, which belongs to Him and obeys Him.

(ix): 7 For whenever the Law decays and there is a rising of unrighteousness, then I create Myself (in visible forms). 8 In order to protect the devout, and to destroy evil-doers, to re-establish the Law, I am born from *yuga* to *yuga* [from age to age].¹ 9 He who thus understands aright My birth and My divine action comes not to rebirth, when he abandons the body, but he comes to Me, O Arjuna.

10 Many there are who thus, freed from inordinate desire, fear and anger, filled with Me, depending on Me, purified with "*jñāna-tapas*"² [austerity of knowledge], have attained to the state of My Being.

11 (In divers ways) men approach Me. verily, according to the manner of their approach do I impart Myself to them. In all their various modes (of religion) they ever follow My path alone. 12 Here they sacrifice to the (various lower) gods, desiring the (worldly) success of their (sacrificial) actions, (and rightly so, for) surely indeed, here in the world of men,³ from these acts of sacrifice there comes forthwith the longed for success (granted by Me). 13 According to the distinction of the *gunas* and *Karman* I created

¹ [Nine incarnations are spoken of and one to come, but there are many more. Śrī Gaurāṅga (Chaitanya), who appeared as a religious reformer in Bengal in the fifteenth century, is held by the Vaishnavas of Bengal to be "neither a human personality, nor even an incarnation, but the absolute Being Bhagavān himself".—G. B. Mallik, *The Philosophy of the Vaisnava Religion*, vol. 1, p. 234.]

² *Tapas* was the asceticism, or castigation, which contained within itself magical powers. Here it is allegorized in the form of *jñāna*—as the "knowledge" that always retains something of its original magical meaning. In v. 33 *jñāna* is conceived as a *yajña*; here, similarly, as *tapas*. Just as *jñāna* is to be practised here as a *tapas*, so in v. 33 it is to be practised as a *yajña* (sacrifice). In both cases the sense remains the same: what *tapas* and *yajña* effected previously, as magic powers in magic practice, is here to be effected by *jñāna*—that is to "burn up" the fatality of action by its magic heat.

³ The cult of the *devas* enjoys success only here, in the world of mankind. For transcendent perfection (*siddhi*), however, it avails nothing; on the context cf. p. 288.

the people of the four castes. For though I am in this way a "worker", still I remain—mark thou this—ever an unchanging "non-worker". 14 (For) actions stain Me not, and no desire have I for the *fruit* of action. He who thus understands Me is (likewise) not bound by actions. 15 With this knowledge action was done also by men of old who desired release. Therefore so do thou do action, as was done before by men of old.

(x): 16 But what is "action", what is "non-action"? Herein even sages have been perplexed. Therefore what the essence of "action" is I will more fully explain to thee; by understanding it aright thou shalt be released from evil. 17 For man must (distinguish and) know about "action", about "wrong action" and about "non-action". Profound is the way of "action". (As has been said of it):

18 "He who can see non-action *in* action, and sees action *in* non-action,

With vision among men (who are blind)—

He is a *yogin* whose action is perfect."

(This means):

19 He whose every undertaking (while it is indeed accomplished), is without desire or purpose, because all his work is (thus) burnt up in the fire of knowledge, is called learned by the wise. 20 (For) whosoever has abandoned attachment to the fruit of actions, ever contented in himself, and independent, even though he is occupied in action—nevertheless he "performs" none.¹ 21 Without desire, and curbing his thoughts, free from desire of possessions, doing merely that action required by the body, he remains free from guilt,² even when he is occupied. 22 Although he acts he is not bound if, satisfied with what he gets by

¹ Here "performs" carries the further implication that "he involves no *Karman* for himself".

² This "guilt" cannot be understood, without further ado, in the sense of the Christian concept of guilt. It is specifically the "evil" of the fatalism due to the bondage of *Karman*.

chance, and beyond the "pairs", he is unenvious and even-minded in success or failure.

(xi): 23 He who is free from attachment, who has won release (from the things of sense), who has established his mind in knowledge, while he employs (this) in "sacrifice", all his action is annihilated.

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

24 The offering is *Brahman* (as the act), the (offered) gift is *Brahman*, and what is sacrificed in the *Brahman*-fire is sacrificed by *Brahman*. Whoever contemplates the act of sacrifice as *Brahman* Itself has attained to *Brahman*.¹ 25 Some devout persons (of the lowest status) celebrate the sacrifice which is intended for the *devas* only. Others (of higher status) certainly offer the sacrifice in the *Brahman*-fire, but as a mere sacrifice. 26 The third group sacrifice the senses of hearing, seeing, and others, in the fire of the conquest of sense. The fourth group sacrifice the objects of sense themselves, such as sound, colour and others in the fire of sense. 27 The fifth type (the technical *yogins*) sacrifice all the activities of the senses and of breath in the fire of *Yoga*, lit by knowledge, together with (psycho-technical) self-restraint. 28 Others, striving, sacrifice possessions,² others practise asceticism, others *Yoga* (in the wider sense) or their knowledge gained from study of the *Vedas*, as sacrifice, or they take upon themselves strict penitential vows. 29 Others again (the *hatha-yogins*) sacrifice out-breathing in in-breathing and in-breathing in out-breathing, since in controlling both they train themselves in "*prāṇāyāma*".² 30 Others practise fasting and so sacrifice the life-spirits in the life-spirits. All these are skilful in sacrifice, and by such sacrifice they remove their stains. 31 (But) he who eats only the remains of the sacrificial food, as the food of immortality, goes to the eternal *Brahman*. Even this world is not for him who sacrifices not; how much less the higher world! 32 The sacrifices, thus many and various, are all performed³ in the mouth of the brahman, know that they are all

¹ [See note on III. 15.] This is intended to mean that *Brahman* is simultaneously the act, object and subject of the sacrifice.

² Restraint of the life-breaths.

³ *Vitan*, "to perform" (Apte's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 7.) In v. 32 the Glossographer returns to his starting point in v. 24.

born of (Vedic ritual) action. If thou understandest them thus, then thou shalt be liberated (through them).

33. Such *jñāna-yajña*¹ [the sacrifice of knowledge] is better than material sacrifice, since all *Karman* culminates wholly in *jñāna*.² 34 Acquire this by adoration and serving (thy *guru*) and by putting eager questions. The possessors of *jñāna*, the philosophers,³ will teach thee such *jñāna*.

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

35 When thou hast once attained this, thou wilt not again fall into bewilderment. Through this thou shalt behold beings all together in thyself and thus in Me.

36 Even though thou art the chief sinner of all sinners, it is by the raft of *jñāna* that thou shalt cross over all guilt.

37 As a burning fire reduces its fuel to ashes, so the fire of *jñāna* reduces all actions to ashes. 38 For there is here no means of expiation that is equivalent to *jñāna*; he who has become perfect in *Yoga*⁴ finds it in time in himself. 39 He who devoutly receives this (*Yoga-Sāṅkhya*)-doctrine and, with senses restrained, is intent on *jñāna*, gains it. When he has gained it, in no long time he attains to supreme peace of soul. 40 But he who lacks *jñāna* [who is ignorant] and without faith (in the doctrine), entertaining doubt, is destroyed. There is neither this world nor another, nor happiness, for him who is sick with doubt. 41 But he who

¹ This is an exact parallel to *jñāna-tapas*, already referred to in v. 10, and is to be understood in precisely the same sense.

² But v. 37 maintains that *jñāna* does not "complete" *Karman*, but burns it "to ashes"; here therefore *parisamāpyate* cannot mean that "*Karman* culminates wholly in *jñāna*" but rather: "in *jñāna* it comes completely to an end".

³ Here again, as previously in II 16, the "tattva-beholders", or the knowers of the classified principles; *jñānin* and *tattvadarśin* are appellations of the *sāṅkhya*s, and these were "the philosophers". The author refers to them because he would very much like to combine *Yoga* with *Sāṅkhya*, cf. v. 39.

⁴ *Yoga* is incorporated within *Sāṅkhya* as a means.

through *Yoga* has renounced (attachment to) action and whose doubt has been cloven asunder by *jñāna*,¹ and who has thus mastered his self, is not bound by actions. 42 Therefore with the sword of *jñāna* cleave asunder this thy doubt² in thy heart, born of ignorance, and be established in *Yoga*. Stand up, O Bhārata.

V

[RENUNCIATION OF ACTIONS]

(TREATISE V—v. *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* are connected together.)³

1 *Arjuna:*

Thou praisest the renunciation of action, O Krishna, and Thou also praisest the *Yoga* (of action). Of these two which is the better? Tell me clearly and with certainty.

2 *The Supreme:*

Renunciation of action and the *Yoga* of action both effect salvation, but of these two the *Yoga* of action is superior to the renunciation of action. 3 (Or yet more truly): He is to be known as (actually) a perpetual renoucer who (while doing actions, nevertheless) cherishes neither aversion nor inclination For he who is thus without the “pairs” is easily freed from bondage. 4 (This comes about alike by *Sāṅkhya* and by *Yoga*): only fools, and not the learned, declare that *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* should be separated. But

¹ That is knowledge of *Sāṅkhya*, so that he is simultaneously a *yogin* and a *sāṅkhya*.

² But with “this doubt” Arjuna’s despair has not the remotest connection.

³ On the details and the general character of this Treatise *cf.* p. 290. It is an Appendix to its predecessor.

whoso treads only one of these two paths to release from bondage gains fully the fruit of both. 5 (For) the state attained by (the knowledge of) *Sāṅkhya* is likewise gained by the practisers of *Yoga*. Whoso sees *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* as *wholly one* sees aright.¹

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

6 Renunciation is hard to obtain without *Yoga*, while the *muni* armed with *Yoga* in no long time reaches *Brahman*. 7 Armed with *Yoga*, with the self purified and subdued, the senses overcome and the self (thus) become the Self of all beings, even though he act he is not stained.

(i, a)²: 8 (Thus the *sāṅkhya*): He who has true *knowledge* should, in the proper way, cherish the thought. "I myself do not act", for whether seeing, feeling, hearing, smelling, eating, walking, sleeping, breathing, 9 speaking, letting go, grasping, or opening and closing the eyes, he cherishes the idea: "Only the senses (which pertain to Nature, not to the self) function in relation to the objects of the senses, (but not I myself)".

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

10 Whoso acts without inclination, resigning his actions to *Brahman*, escapes the evil (which follows upon every action, even the good), like a lotus leaf unstained by water.

(b): 11 (The *yogin* again): It is only through the body, the mind, the intellect and the senses, (but not with the self), that *yogins* perform action,³ which leads them to the purification of the self, in so far as they do this without inclination.

¹ This states the Thesis to be proved, which is more specifically expanded in *vv. 8 ff* The Gloss that immediately follows, in *v. 6*, interrupts this perfectly obvious connection.

² *cf. p. 206.*

³ (Later) *Yoga*, too, accepts the principle that, properly speaking, only "the body, understanding, reason and the senses"—in other words, *Prakṛti*—function. To this, however, it adds the distinctive doctrine that "action", even if free from inclination, is *serviceable*—a thesis that has no meaning whatever for the *sāṅkhya*.

12 (For both paths it is alike true that) he who is trained attains to final peace through freedom from attachment, but he who is untrained is bound through his attachment, the result of his lusts.

(II, a): 13 (And further, on his part, the *sāṅkhya*): After, by *thought*,¹ he has renounced all actions (from the *Purusha* to *Prakriti*), the spiritual subject abides calmly and unassailably² neither acting nor causing to act. 14 Lord of the World, (of objects, their attractions and annoyances), he *produces of himself* neither agency, nor deed, nor the union of deed and fruit; all this pertains to (unspiritual) Nature;— 15 nor does he *take upon himself* the sin of anyone nor his merit, although he permeates all. (Pure) *jñāna* [knowledge] is enveloped by *ajñāna* [ignorance], through which man falls into error (as to the true essence of his pure spiritual subject). 16 But for those whose ignorance of the *ātman* through knowledge is destroyed, their knowledge, like the sun, illumines the Supreme (that is, the absolute Self). 17 Having their intellect on this Supreme, themselves being this Supreme, steadfastly subsisting in Him, wholly directed thereto, they attain the place from where there is no return, freed by *jñāna* from contamination.

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

18 The learned perceive equality between a *brahman*, filled with knowledge and self-discipline, a cow, an elephant, a dog and a cooker of dogs. 19 He whose spirit stands firm in this vision of equality has already overcome Nature in this world (of life). For this faultless equality is *Brahman* Itself; therefore they stand firm in *Brahman* Itself. 20 When one no longer feels glad if conditions are pleasant, and no longer agitated if conditions are unpleasant, when, his spirit steadfastly directed and unbewildered, he is a knower of *Brahman*, then he stands firmly in *Brahman*. 21 Whoso³ is indifferent to all things that

¹ As has been explained in v. 8.

² *Vaśī*: elsewhere described as “independent”.

³ *yas*, with K (Schrader’s *Kashmir Recension*).

affect him from without, finding happiness in himself, trained in *Brahma-Yoga*, attains imperishable happiness,¹ 22 while enjoyments, born of contact with external things, have beginning and end and bring forth nothing but pain. The prudent do not rejoice in them.

(b): 23 (The *yogin* again): He who, before being released from the body, can resist here the agitations of the soul, arising from desire or anger, (by means of strenuous and deliberate self-control), is trained and is a happy man.

A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian:

24 He who has happiness and bliss and light within, such a *yogin*, becoming *Brahman*, attains to the *Nirvāna* of *Brahma*.

25 The masters, who are stainless, freed from doubt, their selves restrained and rejoicing in the welfare of all beings, attain the *Nirvāna* of *Brahma*. 26 To those who are freed from desire and anger, striving with restrained mind and with knowledge of the self, the *Nirvāna* of *Brahma* is near.

27 He who permits no external contacts with himself, directs his gaze on the spot between his eyebrows, makes his out-breathing and in-breathing equal in their passage through his nose, 28 restrained in senses, mind and intellect, silently reclines, intent only on release, without even desire, fear or anger, is in truth released.—29 He knows Me as the great Lord of all the Worlds, as the One to Whom go all sacrifice and discipline, as the Friend of all beings, and thus he attains to peace.²

¹ With K.

² This *Yoga* is therefore *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, though at the same moment more warmly coloured by *Krishna-Bhakti* than the customary *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, while here too the *sāṅkhyā* clearly knows, as what is "highest", only the self-illumination of the *ātman*, which is essentially one with *jñāna*, and his *Kaivalyam* or isolation from the material world, with its ecstasy, and who is thus *An-Īśvara*; cf. v. 16 All this corresponds to relations that are recognized in other contexts, cf. p. 43, n. 2.

VI

[MEDITATION]

(TREATISE VI—VI-IX).¹1 *The Supreme:*

(A, 1): The (true) *sannyāsin* and *yogin* is he who does the action that he ought, without therewith concerning himself with the fruit of action. But not (the *parivrājaka* of olden days)² who renounced the sacred fire and ceremonies.

2 (For verily *Yoga* is an actual “renunciation”; and) know that what they call “renunciation” is the essence of *Yoga*: only he who *renounces* all interests³ is an actual *yogin*,

(A *Gloss*):

3 Action is the means employed by the *muni* who aspires to ascend to *Yoga*. But for him who has already completed the ascent to *Yoga*, the *cessation* of action is henceforth the means (to *Brahma-bhava*)⁴.

4 for when he is not attached to objects of sense nor to actions, because he has *renounced* every interest,⁵ then only is he said actually to be one who has ascended to *Yoga*.

5 Man must himself exalt his self, not (himself) depress his self: for man can himself be both the friend, and the enemy, of his self. 6 He is himself the *friend* of his self when he has of himself conquered himself. But he himself may be the *enemy* (not against his self, but) against the enmity of his own “not-self”.⁶ 7 He who, conquering himself, has attained inner tranquillity, has wholly concentrated his

¹ For the analysis, and the essential features, of this Treatise cf. pp. 208, 291 ff.

² A religious mendicant community.

³ [The purpose of acting so as to gain the fruit]

⁴ The mode of Being of *Brahma*.

⁵ But by no means, the actions themselves, as the clumsy Gloss in v. 3b maintains.

⁶ The “not-self” is constituted by the senses and their incitements.

highest self¹ upon indifference to cold and heat, honour or dishonour, (as to all "pairs"); 8 a true *yogin*, contented with knowledge and understanding, exalted above the being of the world, with senses subdued, to whom a stump, a stone, and gold are of equal value, is rightly called one who is "trained". 9 He excels who maintains the same disposition towards friends and comrades as towards enemies or those who are indifferent, or to those who are sometimes one and sometimes the other, or indeed to evil as to good.

(2): 10 Abiding in a solitary place, remaining alone, controlling his mind, void of desire and free from the wish to possess, the *yogin* should devote himself to the methodical repetition of discipline (of specific *Yoga* technique). 11 In a pure place, he sets up for himself a firm seat, not too high and not too low, with a cloth or a skin or *Kuśa* grass upon it. 12 Sitting there on the seat, he should bring his mind wholly to one point by curbing the play of his senses and mind, and should thus practise (above all) the discipline that conduces towards the purifying of the self. 13 Holding his body, neck and head evenly and unmoved, firmly sitting there, he directs his gaze to the point of his nose, without turning in any other direction. 14 His spirit in perfect peace, freed from fear, true to the vow of chastity,² there let him sit in composure, restraining the *manas* [mind], intent on Me, with his thought on Me.³ 15 When the *yogin* thus methodically trains himself, with *manas* restrained, he attains (to the same) peace of soul as abides within Me and then leads to *Nirvāna*.

16 (This) *Yoga* is not for one who eats too much, nor for

¹ ["Higher self" gives the required meaning, but *paramātman* usually means the supreme self]

² This refers to those sexual impulses which to the primitive *yogin* became objectified as seductive *vikāras* (obstacles).

³ *Īśvara-pranidhāna* (thinking about the Lord) as most powerful *dhāranā*—fixing the mind on its object; cf. p. 207.

one who refrains altogether from food, nor for one of very sleepy habit, nor again for one who refrains from sleep. 17 (Much more) for him who (pursues the proper mean and) controls himself in food and recreation, whose activities are trained in performing actions, in sleeping and waking, *Yoga* becomes a destroyer of pain. 18 When the mind is restrained and fixed on the Self alone, he is (rightly) called "trained", unaffected by all objects of desire. 19 (Thus is this deemed) to be an ancient traditional likeness of the *yogin* of restrained mind, who practises *Ātma-Yoga* [*Yoga* of the self]:

"as a lamp in a windless place flickers not".

20 Thus the mind, restrained by *Yoga* discipline, finds rest, and thus man rejoices in the self, seeing the self only through the Self. 21 He who¹ knows this infinite happiness, which is beyond sense and perceived only spiritually, wherein having become steadfast, he no longer moves from the real, 22 and wherein, after attaining such a destiny, he esteems no other fate whatsoever as higher than this, abiding in which he himself is no more shaken by heavy calamity; this is what is called "Yoga": "separation from conjunction with pain".—

(3): 23 This *Yoga* should be practised with firm resolution and with the mind free from fear and care. 24 Abandoning entirely all desires born of interest, rigorously curbing with his mind the multitude of senses, with his intellect held in a firm grasp, 25 little by little let him come completely to rest (in all the psychical functions), and enclosing his mind wholly in the self, let him no longer cherish any thoughts whatsoever. 26 But should the mind, wavering and unfixed (as it sometimes is) break loose in this direction or that, let him restrain it in all directions and bring it under the control of the self —

¹ *yas*, with K.

(*A Gloss of Theistic Advaita*¹):

27 For the highest happiness comes upon the *yogin* whose mind is calmed, in whom the will (*rajas*) is appeased, becoming *Brahman* and stainless. 28 The *yogin*, thus become stainless, ever training his self, easily attains the infinite happiness of union with *Brahman*. 29 He who is well trained in *Yoga* discipline, and in all things sees only the one and the same, beholds his self in all beings and all beings in his self. 30 Whoso sees Me in all things, and sees all things in Me, I am not lost to him, nor is he lost to Me. 31 He who, established in oneness, reveres Me as abiding in all things, may sojourn where he will: where'er he dwells, he dwells in Me. 32 And he who sees others like himself, and therefore sees in all things pleasure and pain (like his own), is the supreme *yogin*.²

33 *Arjuna*:

Because of this “unsteadiness” of *manas* I do not see how steadfastness, as persistence in this *Yoga*, which Thou hast expounded as equanimity, can be possible. 34 For verily our mind is unsteady, harassing, violent and obstinate. To curb it I think is as hard as to curb the wind.

35 *The Supreme*:

Doubtless the inconstant mind is hard to curb. But by methodical effort and the surrender of desire one can grasp it. 36 Verily, I believe, for him who lacks strenuous self-discipline *Yoga* is hard to win. But the *aspirant*, who exerts authority over himself, can win it by applying the (methodical) means.

(4): 37 *Arjuna*:

If now someone (who has entered upon the path of *Yoga*), again wanders away and does not persist in *endeavour*, and therefore attains not the goal of *Yoga*, yet is endowed with *faith*, what befalls him? 38 Is he indeed lost, having

¹ Philosophic Non-duality.

² For an alternative version cf. p. 292.

wandered from both paths,¹ like a scattered cloud (lost in air), void of support, and wandering as to the way of *Brahman*?² 39 Dispel this my doubt utterly, for no other save Thee can do so.

40 *The Supreme Exalted One:*

Neither on this side, nor beyond, O Pā尔tha, is such a one destroyed. For no one who practises the virtue (of faith) will fare evilly. 41 Such a one who has indeed fallen from *Yoga* (but abides in faith) comes, (according to the merit of his faith), to the worlds of those who have acquired merit. After he has dwelt there for long ages (he must indeed return to rebirth in this world, but) he is then born anew in a house of pure and high-born people. 42 Or he comes even to the family of high-born *yogins*: yet such a birth in this world is harder to win. 43 Here he acquires anew the same grade of intelligence which he had in his former life. Then he continues his effort (at that time interrupted) to the complete end. 44 For his effort, previously undertaken, (now operates) as a compulsion which draws him towards the right way. (Whence it follows that) even the mere student of *Yoga* advances beyond the *Vedas* (and whatever these can impart). 45 But the *yogin* (who not merely believes and studies *Yoga* doctrine, but) who strives with all his power, having become after many rebirths a (perfect) *siddha*, purified from stain, goes the highest way. 46 Higher than "penitents", higher than the "men of knowledge", higher than the persons of *Karma-mārga*,³ is he held.—Therefore, Arjuna, become a *yogin*.

¹ He wandered from the Vedic path when he entered upon the *Yoga* way, and from the *Yoga* path when he relinquished his "striving"; cf. Hill's Note.

² Here again this simply means "the way of salvation".

³ The "path" or "way" of *Karma*.

(*B: The Higher Stage: Bhakti Theology*).

(1): 47 But of all *yogins* I hold him to be *yogin* most completely who, his innermost self directed towards Me, worships Me in faith.

VII

[KNOWLEDGE OF THE LORD]

1 (Therefore) hearken (again) to Me: when thou dost practise *Yoga* with thy mind attached to Me and trusting in Me, thou mayest without doubt know Me entirely. 2 I will declare to thee fully this knowledge and understanding; once thou knowest it, nought else remains for thee, (except this), that is worthy to be known. 3 (For) among thousands of human beings, but some *one* individual strives for *Siddhi* [success], and even of the strivers who have become *siddhas*, (but some) one individual knows Me in reality.

4 Earth, water, fire, air, aether, mind, intellect, and the thought of I [(individuality)] are My “Nature” in its eight-fold division,¹ 5 and verily My *lower* Nature. But know too My other (*higher*) Nature—that of the Soul, by which the world is sustained. 6 Mark thou—in these two all beings have their source. (Through these) I (Myself) am the origin and the dissolution of the whole world; 7 there is nothing higher than I. On Me all “this” (worldly being) is strung, like strings of pearls on the thread. . . .

(*A Gloss in the sense of Treatise VIII*):

8 I am taste in water, splendour in moon and sun, OM in all the *Vedas*, sound in aether, maleness in men, 9 pure smell in

¹ [These are the forms which unmanifested Nature takes when it becomes manifested. They appear to be an early classification, which was elaborated into twenty-four. A longer list is given in XIII. 5, which almost coincides with that of classical *Sāṅkhya*.]

earth, brilliance in fire, life in all beings, (magic) power in the penitent; *10* know that I am the eternal Power of the seed of all beings, the intellect of the intelligent, the brilliance of the brilliant. *11* I am the strength of the strong, in so far as he is free from desire and passion; I am the love instinct in beings, in so far as it remains within the bounds of the Law.

12 . . . and know that all natures that are of (the three *gunas*), *sattva*, *rajas*, *tamas*, [the constituents of goodness, passion and dullness]¹ are only from Me, yet so that I am not in them (and disappear), but they are in Me. *13* Owing to these natures being formed of the *gunas*, all these (unenlightened) persons are deluded, and know not *Me* (behind and above the play of the *gunas*), as the changeless that is distinct from these. *14* For this My divine *Māyā* [delusion], sustained by the *gunas*, is hard to grasp; only they who take their refuge in Myself overcome it.

(2): *15* *Evil doers*, these lowest of men, do not take refuge in Me, their knowledge (of Myself) carried away by their infatuation with *Māyā*, because they have betaken themselves to a diabolical (vicious) nature,² *16* but those *who do good* worship Me. There are four kinds of these: the afflicted, he who strives for gain,³ the seeker after knowledge, and the possessor of knowledge.⁴ *17* Of these four the

¹ [In material natures these appear as lightness, motion, and heaviness.]

² The play of the creative Power that operates as the *gunas* (as constituents of Nature) blinds them to the One Who possesses this Power. Consequently, they become philosophical Naturalists. But this is the fault of their own vicious character.

³ [Śankara interprets as *dhanakāmo*, "desirous of wealth". There are here four stages of people, one who has suffered losses, one who desires something better, one who wants something good but does not necessarily know what it is, and one who does know.]

⁴ This fourfold division becomes a permanent *articulus* in the *ordo salutis* of *Bhakti* theology, and had indeed long been so when this was written. The "afflicted" one is he who is distressed, especially he who suffers the evil of *Samsāra*; the one "who strives for gain" is devout and so far upright, but he needs God merely for

possessor of knowledge, (that is to say) he who is ever devout and loves Me alone, is pre-eminent; for to such a one I am dear beyond all, and (therefore) he is dear to Me. 18 Eminent indeed are all these four (in preference to the godless of v. 15), but the fourth I esteem¹ as My own Self. He has, with self-composure, entered upon the way of all ways: the way to Me. 19 Having become, at the end of many births, a man of knowledge, he approaches Me with the confession: "Vāsudeva is all". One so exalted is hard to find.²

20 Those (who lack "self-composure", and) whose knowledge is carried away by various desires, resort to other (lower) divinities; compelled by their own nature, they follow now this, and again that, precept (of religion). 21 But whoso wishes, with (true) devotion and faith, to worship any form (of the gods), whichever this may be, I Myself render this faith of his firm (and successful as regards his desires). 22 Armed with such a faith he strives to propitiate (his own individual god), and thence receives his desires. But it is by Me alone that they are bestowed. 23 For merely *finite* is the fruit which these men of little insight desire, and those who sacrifice to *devas* attain only to their *devas*, only to the *siddhas* the worshipper of the *siddhas*, only to spirits they who sacrifice to spirits.³ 24 The unwise imagine Me, the imperceptible, as having become perceptible, not knowing My highest Nature, changeless and absolute.⁴ 25 For I am not manifested to everyone, being

his own purposes and does not seek Him for His own sake, "the seeker after knowledge" has started on the right way, while "the possessor of knowledge" has travelled far along it. As for Rāmānuja, "knowledge" is here to be understood as *eka-Bhakti*;—devotion to One alone.

¹ *matah*, with K.

² The author has just explained that God, in virtue of His two Natures, is "all".

³ With K.

⁴ These are the philosophical Naturalists, who believe that God is merged within Nature, in the play of the *gunas*, and identify God with external Nature.

enveloped by My *Māyā* of miraculous Power. Deluded thus, this world knows Me not as the unborn and changeless, 26 and while I know all beings, past, present and future, no one knows Me; 27 rather do all beings fall into delusion by their very birth, and indeed through the delusive power of the “pairs”, which arises from inclination and aversion (to worldly things). 28 But they in whom evil has ceased, being persons of pure actions, are released from delusion by the “pairs” and, steadfast in their service, worship Me. 29 They who strive for release from old age and death, in (simple) trust in Me, (require no sublime theology nor speculation, but) know by its means “*Brahman*” complete and “*Adhyātmam*” and all “*Karman*” [*Brahma* complete as present in the self, and all action]. 30 They who know *Me* as “*Adhidaivam*”, also as “*Adhibhūtam*” and as “*Adhiyajña*” [as present in the gods, as present in beings, and as present in the sacrifice], and also at the time of their departure, which alone is true knowledge, with trained minds. . . .

VIII

[THE LORD AS BRAHMA THE IMPERISHABLE]

(*A Gloss*):

1 *Arjuna*:

What is “that *Brahman*”, what that “*Adhyātmam*”, what is “*Karman*” and “*Adhibhūtam*”, which has been spoken about? [that present in the self, action, present in beings]. What is that which is called “*Adhidaivam*”? [present in the gods]. 2 Of what nature is “*Adhiyajña*”? [present in the sacrifice] and who is the *Adhiyajña*, here in this body?¹ And how art Thou to be known in the hour of death?

• 1 This question, however, has not yet been propounded.

3-4 *The Supreme:*

“Brahman”¹ means the *Aksharam*² [indestructible] as the Supreme. Its *Nature* is expressed by “*Adhyātmam*” [present in the self]. The creative Power of that which effects the origin of the substances of creatures is called “*Karman*”³; “*Adhibhūtam*” [present in beings] is the perishable substance (of creatures).⁴ *Adhidaivatam* [the present in the gods] is the primeval *Purusha* [Person]; the *Adhiyajñas* [the present in the sacrifice] is I Myself (Krishna) here in My body.⁵

(3, a): . . . 5 and who goes forth, thinking solely on Me in the last hour, attains My Being after leaving the body; of that there is no doubt. 6 For verily, on whatever mode of Being one thinks at the end, when he abandons the body, to that very Being he attains, since he is now in the form thereof. 7 Therefore at all times⁷ think upon Me, and fight. With mind and intellect directed towards Me, then surely shalt thou come to Me. 8 For, (as indeed an ancient hymn declares), whoso thinks ever upon Him goes to the supreme divine Spirit, with his mind trained by methodical *Yoga* and not following after another.⁸

(Thus the hymn):

9 He who thinks upon a WISE BEING,
Ancient, disposer of all things,
More minute than the minute, Creator of all things,

¹ [Brahma as the one reality is neuter. *Brahmā* (masculine) is a god, and like the other gods only one manifestation of Krishna or the real, as in xi 15.]

² This is an ancient scholastic term for the transcendent and impersonal *Brahman*.

³ But the writer of vii. 29, certainly did not assign this meaning to the word. ⁴ But this is quite impossible.

⁵ [*Purusha* is the usual term in *Sāṅkhya* for the self]; cf. also p. 248.

⁶ But this doctrine never appears in *The Gītā*.

⁷ “At all times”: then shalt thou succeed also in having Me in thy mind in the critical last moments. (Śridhara)

⁸ This verse is intended to introduce an ancient hymn about the “supreme divine Spirit”, authoritatively substantiating what precedes.

Inconceivable in Form, bright as the sun, beyond the darkness—

10 With unshaken mind, at the time of his departure,
 Armed with love as with the power of *Yoga*,
 Making his breath duly pass between his eyebrows,
 Goes to that divine, supreme, primeval Spirit.

11 That region¹ will I shortly declare to thee,²
 Which knowers of the *Vedas* call “indestructible”,
 Attained by the strivers freed from desire,
 Yearning for which they live in sacred chastity.

(This means):

12-13 He who closes all the outlets of the emanating outer senses, and restraining the inner sense within the heart, fixing the breath of life in his own head, (behind the midpoint between the brows), uttering OM, *Brahman*³ the one syllable, practising the *Yoga* method of fixing the thoughts and ever thinking on Me, when thus he goes forth abandoning the body, goes the highest way.⁴ 14 By such a *yogin*, ever trained, whose mind is never elsewhere, who thinks on Me, I am easily attainable. 15 Once these noble ones have attained to Me and thus arrived at the highest goal, they shall not undergo rebirth, this condition of pain and inconstancy. 16 (All) the worlds, even the world of

¹ This “region” is the oft-named “highest place of Vishnu”, where one is eternally with Vishnu in the divine mode of Being—the *Avyakta-Bhāva*, described by the writer of this Treatise in v. 20.

² It is obvious that the hymn must have included a description, however brief, of this “highest place of Vishnu”, though the author omits to cite it. But in the following verses he *comments* on the hymn.

³ Here *Brahman* is to be understood in its primitive sense of the sacred word.

⁴ Verses 12 and 13 form a commentary on the first three lines of the second strophe of the hymn, 14 to 16 on the fourth line; 17-21 comment on its third strophe—on the divine mode of Being in Vishnu’s “highest place”.

Brahma, must return again, but he who has once attained to Me undergoes rebirth no more.

(b): 17 He who¹ knows that a day of *Brahma* endures for a thousand *yugas* [ages], and likewise a night of *Brahma* a thousand *yugas*, knows what “day and night” is. 18 At the coming of “day” all manifestations proceed from the unmanifested, and at this “nightfall” they are again dissolved into this unmanifested. 19 These manifestations are this host of (visible individual) beings. This host, after it has repeatedly (in the succession of rebirths) entered into existence, is ultimately (as has been said) dissolved at the coming of “night” into the “unmanifested”; likewise it proceeds anew, in accord with necessity (and law), from the “unmanifested” at break of “day”. 20 But higher than this unmanifested there is yet another state of Being, unmanifested, which verily changes *not*. This perishes not, even when all things perish, 21 and therefore this unmanifested is called the *indestructible* unmanifested.² They call this the supreme way, for whoso attains to this returns not. This means “My supreme abode” (in the fourth strophe of the hymn).

(c): 22 But *Purusha* (of whom the hymn speaks in the first strophe) is “the Highest”.³ Who is attained by undivided *love* (*Bhakti*); in Him abide all beings and by Him is OM supported.

(*A Mythological Gloss*):

23 Now will I declare to thee the *time at which*, when he departs, the *yogin* returns not, and the time at which, departing,

¹ *ye*, with K

² In later theology this “unmanifested” is called *suddha-sattvam*, because it is the supersensuous mode of Being; it is the substance from which Vishnu’s celestial body is composed. In this one has the same form as God, “excluding rule over the Universe”, which God reserves for Himself; cf. pp. 180, 221, 296.

³ The highest form of deity, in which it is pure and absolute *Spirit*.

he must return. 24 Whoso departs by fire, light, day, the waxing moon, or the six months of the sun's Northern path, if he is a knower of *Brahman* (that is to say, orthodox), goes to *Brahman*. 25 By smoke, night, the waning moon, or the six months of the sun's Southern path--then the *yogin* goes to moonlight and must thence return. 26 These two ways, the "light" and the "dark", are held to be the immutable paths of world (of man). By the former he goes to return not, by the other he returns.

27 No *yogin* who knows these two paths, O Pārtha, is bewildered by them. Therefore at all times be thou armed with *Yoga*.¹ 28 (As saith the poem):

The fruit of merit promised in the *Vedas*,
In sacrifice, in penitence, in alms,
Initiates leave behind, and pass
As *yogins* to the highest primal realm.

IX

[THE ROYAL KNOWLEDGE AND SECRET]

(*A Gloss of a Dvaita Theologian*).²

r The Supreme:

But now I will tell to thee, because thou listenest willingly, this most secret knowledge and understanding; when thou hast attained it, thou wilt be released from evil. 2 It is royal knowledge, the royal secret, the best means of purification, it is clearly intelligible, in accordance with *Dharma* [righteous], easy to perform, changeless. 3 He who believes not in this *Dharma*³

¹ [This passage, 23-27, has been held to be a late addition, but it is simply repeating the teaching found in several *Upanishads* (*Brihadār*, vi. 2, 15; *Chānd.*, v. 10, 1; *Praśna*, i. 4, 9). *The Mahābhārata* itself tells how Bhishma, when fatally wounded in the battle, practised *Yoga* and postponed his death, so that he might die at the auspicious time when the sun was in its northern course between the winter and the summer solstices.]

² On the general character of this Gloss cf. pp 222 ff. *Dvaita* is philosophical Duality.

³ This verse already exhibits the stern tone of the uncompromising *Dvaita-vāda* (doctrine) that is so characteristic of Mādhwā.

[righteousness] must return to the path of death and *Samsāra*, because he has not attained to Me.¹

4 (Hearken therefore): "By Me in the form of the unmanifested this All is permeated; in Me abide all beings, but I endure not in them—" (thus hath it been said before; but yet more truly) 5 beings "abide" not in Me, (in so far as this is believed to be any kind of participation in My Being). Know rather (My relation to them is solely that) My *creative* Power is their (far transcendent) LORD. "Creator" and "sustainer" of creatures am I, yet I Myself "abide" not in them.² 6 But understand (My relation to them) thus: As the wind extends everywhere far into space, (without wind participating in the nature of space), (only) thus are all creatures in Me.³

(4): 7 (As I have said), all these beings come to an end in My own (lower) Nature, and at the beginning of a new *Kalpa* [world-cycle] I release them again (therefrom). 8 By means of the Nature, pertaining to Me, again and again I create this host of beings, which are of themselves devoid of will and of power in relation to the necessity of Nature (which depends on Me). 9 (But though I am thus incessantly active creatively), these actions bind Me not, since to these actions I remain indifferent and am not attached to them.

(5): 10 Nature produces that which moves and that which moves not, and is also the cause of the world cycle (in ever new evolutions and involutions), *but under My care* (and as My mask).

¹ The pompous terms of this brief Section indicate that an extremely self-conscious and controversial tendency is attempting here to appropriate all that precedes for the purposes of its own scholastic orthodoxy—that of dualistic doctrine (*Dvaita-vāda*); cf. pp. 222 ff.

² [The Lord as Nature is the material cause of the world, and hence is immanent; but he is also transcendent.]

³ At this point the Glossographer again inserts his *Dvaita* Gloss, in order to immunize *a priori* the terms that immediately follow in the Treatise about *Prakṛiti* (Matter, or Nature) because they most emphatically stress the principle that, essentially, it pertains to God.

11 The deluded fail to recognize Me, because I have thus assumed the *form of Nature*¹ (as the form of My manifestation and operation), since they misjudge My transcendent essence—that of the (purely spiritual) Great Lord of all beings. 12 They are void of insight, and vain are their desires, their actions and thoughts, because of their demonic, and verily diabolical nature, which blinds them (to the actual conditions). 13 But the noble, because of their divine nature, know Me as the changeless origin of beings, and depend upon Me with single minds. 14 Ever praising Me, steadfast in service, striving, revering Me, they worship Me in increasing composure with *Bhakti* . . . (continued in v. 20).

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

15 Others practise the *jñāna-yajña* [sacrificing with the sacrifice of knowledge] and worship Me “as one or as several”, in unity and severality in many forms, (as thus):² 16 “I am the (Vedic) sacrifice, I am the (universal) sacrifice, the offering to the fathers am I, I am the (sacrificial) herb, the sacrificial formula, the sacrificial butter, the sacrificial fire, the offering in the sacrificial fire. 17 I am the Father of this Universe, Mother, Creator, Ancestor, the Object of sacred knowledge, the means of purification, the uttering of OM and the *Rig-Sama-Yajur-Veda*,³ 18 the way, the supporter, the Lord, the witness,

¹ It seems quite clear to me that *prākṛti* *tanum* must have been employed here, instead of the quite meaningless *mānushī* *tanum*. For there is no reference whatever to an *avatāra* (incarnation, literally, “descent”), but only to God’s eternal activity under the mask of “Nature”, exactly as in several preceding Sections. I imagine that the same reviser who interpolated the *Dvārā* Glosses is responsible for this modification in terms of an *avatāra*, since to his mind this thoroughgoing identification of the divine “creative Power”, as the purely transcendent relation of Deity to the creature, with the operation of the processes of Nature, was absolutely intolerable.

² In this respect, in fact, the examples that follow exhibit the dual aspect of Identity and Transcendence of the old *Brahman*.

³ [The *Veda* of hymns, the *Veda* of chants, and the *Veda* which besides hymns contains sacrificial formulas.]

the abode (of Being?), the friend, origin, duration¹ and dissolution (of the Universe), the changeless seed of life. 19 I heat (the Universe), I hold back the rain and send it forth streaming. I am immortality and death, Being and Non-Being am I'.

20 (This verse refers to the *Veda* sacrificers):

They who know the three *Vedas*, purified by drinking *soma*,

Sacrificing to Me, entreat the way to Heaven.

Verily, they attain to Indra's world of merit,²

And gain the heavenly bliss divine.

21 And when they have enjoyed the spacious world of Heaven,³

And their merit is exhausted, again they return.

Thus he who, cherishing desires, follows the Vedic law, Finds only incessant *going and coming*.

22 (But referring to the *bhaktas*):

A sure possession⁴ [the gaining of peace]⁵ I bring to those who, thinking on Me with single heart, worship Me and so are ever bound to Me.

23 But he who, as the servant of other deities, sacrifices to them, if he does this in faith, sacrifices to Me alone, though not according to the manner prescribed of old.

24 For I alone am the receiver and the Lord of all sacrifices. But they know Me not in truth, and hence they fall (back into *Samsāra*). 25 They who worship *devas* go to the *devas*, to the fathers those who worship the fathers, to the

¹ *Sthānam*: is this due to the verse, in place of *sthitī*, which usually is found regularly with *prabhava* and *pralaya*?

² The celestial worlds, attained by ritual desert.

³ Indra's.

⁴ Instead of the continuous "going and coming" of the *Veda*-servers.

⁵ [Yogakshema. This is a word with a long history, which has changed its meaning more than once. In II. 45, it is something to be avoided, and there means, according to Śankara, the protecting of what has been gained. In Buddhist texts it means *nirvāna*, and probably has that meaning here in the sense of final goal.]

spirits they who sacrifice to spirits. Likewise, they who sacrifice to Me go to Me.

(6: *Praise of Bhakti.*)

26 If one with *Bhakti* offers Me only a leaf, a flower, a fruit, or water,¹ I graciously accept this, because it is offered with *Bhakti*, as though coming from a devout mind. 27 Whatever thou doest, or eatest, or givest or sacrificest, whatever austerity thou dost pursue, do that as an offering to Me. 28 Thus shalt thou be released from the bonds of *Karman*, which are the consequences of both good and evil actions. Armed with this *Yoga* which is (also true) *Sannyāsa* [renunciation] and freed by this, thou shalt come to Me. 29 For (while, moreover, I) am of even mind towards all beings and cherish aversion or inclination to none, yet they who adhere to Me with *Bhakti* abide in Me and I also in them. 30 Verily, even if he is an evil liver, but adheres to Me with undivided *Bhakti*, he must be held devout, for through *Bhakti* he has become a man of "just resolution".² 31 (In virtue of this resolution) he quickly becomes of righteous soul and attains eternal peace.—Mark this, O son of Kuntī, My *bhakta* is not destroyed. 32 Those also of base birth, even women, *vaiśyas* and *śūdras*,³ if only they take their refuge in Me, go the highest way, 33 how much more pure brahmans and royal sages, if they are *bhaktas*. Therefore worship Me, since thou hast entered this impermanent, sorrowful world, 34 keep Me in thy heart, be My *bhakta*, sacrificing to Me. Reverence Me. To me alone shalt thou go if thou, thus training thyself, makest Me thy highest goal.

¹ *mathkarmāni* in its technical sense.

² Through this he has become "a convert". I have previously commented on the analogy between "firm resolution" and our own ideas about reformation, penitence and conversion.

³ [The agricultural and trading class, and the servile class.]

X

[THE LORD'S VASTNESS]

(Resumption of *The Original Gītā*, interrupted at II. 37: Krishna reveals himself to Arjuna as God, "from Whom everything arises", and demands Arjuna's service.)

1 The Supreme Exalted One:

Now hear further My *supreme*¹ utterance: because thou art dear to Me, I will proclaim it to thee for thy good.

2 Neither the hosts of *devas* nor the great *rishis* [sages] know My source. (For) altogether more ancient than they am I. 3 He who knows Me as the unborn, the beginningless, the great Lord of the world, *he* among mortals, free from delusion, is released from all sins.²

4 From Me alone arise of beings the manifold states of mind: power of decision, judgment (*buddhi*),³ knowledge, purity of spirit, capacity to endure, true insight, discipline, serenity, pleasure and pain, well-being⁴ and distress,⁵ fear and reliance, 5 compassion, equanimity, contentment, self-control, doing good, glory and infamy. 6 (Likewise the primeval beings), the seven great *rishis* and the four *Manus*,⁶ (arose only) from Me, generated by My Spirit; (and) from them descend these creatures in the world.⁷ 7 He who knows in

¹ The "utterance" concerning the indestructibility of the spiritual being, the appeal to martial duty and honour, were exalted, but these were not the "supreme utterance", this, rather, is that Arjuna should attain the "insight" of v. 8 (the lack of which has been censured in II. 17) that God, Who has descended as Krishna, demands Arjuna's reverence and *service*, since He is Ruler of all.

² This refers to Arjuna's sorrow over his sin

³ Arjuna believed that he himself possessed this.

⁴ *bhava*—well-being; Apte's *Dictionary*, 6.

⁵ Want, *ibid.*, 2.

⁶ [Manu is the first man at the beginning of each new race of beings. The four are four ancient sages.]

⁷ God alone therefore, and not Arjuna, must determine its fate.

truth this manifestation of My Might and My creative Power is armed with unshakable constancy.¹

8 I am the source of all, from Me everything arises²—
Whoso has insight knows this. And with this insight he worships Me, impressed by awe.³—

The Original Gitā is resumed in XI.

(*A Gloss of the Bhakti Theologian*):

9 They who have their minds on Me, and have turned their life to Me, are happy and blessed, since they enlighten one another and converse about Me. 10 To those who are ever and wholly devout I impart *Buddhi-Yoga*⁴ [the *Yoga* of the intellect] whose foundation is love (to Me). Through this they attain to Me. 11 Abiding within their own being,⁵ to manifest My grace I expel the darkness born of ignorance with the flaming lamp of knowledge.

(TREATISE VIII—x. 12-42: an interpolated Hymn in Praise of Krishna.)

12 *Arjuna*:

The supreme *Brahman*, the supreme abode, the highest means of purification art Thou; the primal, divine *Purusha*, the first of gods, the unborn, omnipresent, 13 thus all seers speak of Thee, and likewise Nārada the messenger of the gods, Asīta, Devala, Vyāsa, and Thou Thyself tellest me. 14 All this I believe to be true, O Keśava, because

¹ Arjuna lacks this, because he does not perceive the control of the Ruler of all.

² Even this fearful slaughter, on which Arjuna must pass no judgment.

³ This is the first demand to Arjuna, to obey God.

⁴ The “firmly founded wisdom” of the power of resolution, which has already been indicated, in ii. 54 ff., as the characteristic feature of *Yoga*. It is equally valid for *Bhakti-Yoga*, although it has here the *caritas praecedens* as its presupposition.

⁵ Here Krishna is not merely the divine teacher of salvation, as in *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, but He is the redeeming light of salvation itself.

Thou hast proclaimed it to me,¹ for even *devas* and *dānavas*² understand not Thy visible appearance. 15 Only Thou Thyself knowest Thyself through Thyself, O Highest Spirit, Creator of beings, Lord of spirits, God of gods, Ruler of the world. 16 Deign then to tell me in full of Thy glorious Self-manifestations, in which Thou abidest permeating these worlds. 17 For how shall I myself comprehend Thee, the heavenly *Yogin*,³ however much I brood? In which of the different forms of Being may I think upon Thee, O supreme One?⁴ 18 Tell me more at length⁵ of Thy wondrous Power and (especially) of Thy Self-manifestation,⁶ for I am never sated with hearing Thy ambrosial words.

19 *The Supreme:*

Come, I will tell thee of My glorious manifestations, yet only of the chief of these, because to tell thee all about Myself would have no end.

20 I am the *Ātman* abiding within all beings; I am the beginning, the middle, and the end of beings. 21 Of the *Ādityas*⁷ I am Vishnu, of shining beings the gleaming sun, Marīki of the winds, the moon among the constellations,

¹ I believe Thy words absolutely, because I am not myself capable of comprehension; even Thy visible appearance gives me no insight, for

² [Supernatural beings hostile to the gods, reckoned as a class of *asuras*; the *Dāityas* (v. 30) are another class. For the myth of the *asuras* see xvi.]

³ The mysterious worker of marvels.

⁴ What objects, men, *devas* or other entities must I interpret as manifestations of Thee?

⁵ This is an attempt to connect the eulogy which immediately follows with the earlier *Text*.

⁶ *vibhūti*, in later theology, a special type of hypostasis of Deity, together with the *vyūhas* or "emanations". Here too it has the same significance. The *optimum* in every species is regarded as a hypostasis or self-manifestation of Deity.

⁷ [A class of seven or eight Vedic gods; the names of the following gods are also Vedic.]

22 of the *Vedas* I am the *Sāmaveda*,¹ of the *devas* Indra, of the senses I am the *manas* [mind], the consciousness of beings,² 23 of the *Rudras* I am Śankara, of the *Yakshas* and *Rākshases*³ Kubera, of the *Vasus* Agni [fire], and of mountains Meru. 24 Of household priests know that I am the foremost, Brihaspati, of generals I am Skanda, of waters the ocean, 25 of the great *rishis* Bhrigu, of words the one syllable OM, of sacrifices the murmured sacrifice, of firm-fixed things the Himālaya, 26 of all trees the *Aśvattha*-fig tree [sacred fig tree], of divine *rishis* Nārada, of the *gandharvas* [heavenly musicians] Citraratha, of *siddhas*⁴ the *muni* Kapila, 27 among horses know Me as Uccaihśravas, sprung from ambrosia,⁵ among king-elephants Airāvata, and among men the Lord, 28 of weapons I am the thunderbolt, of cows the cow of desires, I am the begetter(?) Cupido, of serpents I am Vāsuki, 29 I am Ananta of dragons, Varuna of water creatures, 30 I am Prahlāda of the *Dāityas*, of the calculators Time, of wild beasts the lion, and Garuda of birds,⁶ 31 of purifiers the wind, I am Rāma of those that bear the sword, of water monsters the crocodile, of streams I am the Ganges, 32 of creations the beginning, middle and end,⁷ of sciences the science of the self, I am the dialectic⁸ among (methods of) conducting controversies, 33 of tones I am *A*, of the compound word the *dvamdvam*

¹ This high estimate of *The Sāmaveda* is frequently encountered; cf. *Sanatsujātāparvan*, 43, 28: "in the *pure Sāma* songs".

² This is a striking expression, which may mean "of the spiritual fundamental components".

³ [Classes of goblin-like spirits.]

⁴ [Those who have attained perfection in this life; Kapila is the traditional author of the *Sāṅkhya* philosophy.]

⁵ [The drink of immortality. When the gods churned the ocean to obtain the drink of immortality, other treasures were produced also, among them the horse and the cow of desires.]

⁶ [Garuda, the bird of Vishnu]

⁷ Therefore the three cardinal aspects of all creation.

⁸ *vāda*, with Hill and Śankara.

[copulative].¹—I alone am inexhaustible Time, I the Creator facing every way, 34 and I am Death sweeping away all, likewise the origin of all that shall be. Of the Graces I am *Gloria*, *Fortuna*, *Suāda*, *Memoria*, *Sapientia*, *Constantia*, *Patientia*, 35 of the sacred melodies I am the *Brihat*, of metres the *Gāyatrī*,² of the months I am January, of the seasons, Spring. 36 Of deceitful things I am the game of dice, the brilliance of the brilliant, victory, resolution, the excellence of the excellent, 37 of the *Vrishnis* *Vāsudeva*,³ of the *Pāndavas* Arjuna, of the *munis* Vyāsa, of seers Uśanas. 38 Of (instruments of) punishment I am the rod, I am statecraft among the means of victory, the silence of secrets, knowledge in the knowers. 39 Whatever is the power of the seed of all things, I am. Nor is there a creature that moves or moves not that may exist without Me. 40 No end is there of My glorious manifestations. But in place of a detailed enumeration I have given thee only divers examples of these. 41 Whatever manifests power, whatever is excellent, sublime, mighty, know that always as having sprung from a portion of My splendour. 42 What (especially) profits thee now in this vast knowledge is that I abide, sustaining the whole Universe with one single portion of My Power.

¹ [A compound of two nouns, *e.g.* *pānīpadam*, "hand and foot".]

² [A verse of twenty-four syllables, especially the verse in this metre, recited daily by brahmins, the *Sāvitrī*:

Upon that excellent glory
Of God Savitar may we think,
That he may stimulate our thoughts.]

³ [Vrishni was an ancestor in the family of Krishna. *Vāsudeva* is a name of Krishna, as the son of Vasudeva.]

XI

[THE LORD AS ALL FORMS]

(Resumption of *The Original Gītā*, interrupted at X. 8.)

1 Arjuna:

Thou hast proclaimed, in order to comfort me, the supreme secret of the true Self (and also its indestructibility).¹ Through this Thy Word my bewilderment is gone from me, *2* for as it is appointed to beings to exist and to pass away, so verily has it been in my own experience.² And likewise hast Thou taught me Thy imperishable Majesty.³

3 I desire to behold with my eyes this Thy Form as God, O *Purushottama* [O Highest Person], even as Thou Thyself hast (just) declared it, O Supreme Lord. *4* If, O Lord, Thou deemest that I am able to behold it, then show me Thyself as the Imperishable, O Lord of wondrous Power.

5 The Supreme:

“Behold then, O Pā尔tha, My hundredfold and thousandfold Forms, manifold, divine, of many colours and shapes: *6* behold the *Ādityas*, *Vasus*, *Rudras*, the two *Aświns* and the *Maruts*. Behold many marvels, such as were never seen before.

(*A Gloss:*)

7 Behold here in My Body, in unity, the entire world, whatever in it moves and moves not, and whatever else thou hast a wish to see.

8 But thy bodily eye is too feeble to behold Me thus; the divine eye I give thee. Behold Me thus in My wondrous Power as *LORD*.”

9 As He thus spake, Hari, the great God of wondrous

¹ This refers to II. 11-30.

² This refers specifically to strophes II. 20; 22, 29, 30.

³ Section x. 1-8.

Power, allowed Pā尔tha to see His supreme Form as that of the LORD, 10 with manifold mouths and eyes, in divers wondrous aspects,¹ wearing many divine adornments, with many divine weapons upraised, 11 in divine garlands and robes, anointed with divine scents, His countenance facing every way; a God, all marvellous, infinite. 12 The splendour of the Supreme was as though in the heavens the splendour of a thousand suns all together should blaze out.

(*A Gloss ?*):

13 There, in the Body of the God of gods, Pāndava saw in one the whole world manifoldly divided.

14 Thereat was Arjuna filled with amazement; with hair on end, he clasped his hands, bowed down his head, and addressed God:

(*A Gloss ?*):

15 I see all gods, O God, within Thy Body,
And likewise (many kinds of) hosts of spirits:
Brahma, the Lord upon the lotus-throne,
The *rishis* all, and the divine snake-spirits

16 Thyself behold I, wholly infinite,
Unnumbered arms and bodies, mouths and eyes,
(Having) no end, no middle, no beginning,
I see Thee, Lord of all, all forms possessing.

17 Bearer of crown, of mace and discus, see I,
A sea of splendour, shining all around
On all sides, a sun-flash of colossal flame.
A prospect I can scarce endure.

(*A Gloss ?*):

18 Thou are *Aksharam*,² wisdom's highest object,
Thou of this All th' exalted place of treasure,
The changeless guardian of primeval Law,
The primal Spirit of Eternity. So deem I Thee.

¹ With Hill. Or, with Garbe, "with many marvellous things to contemplate".

² [The Eternal.]

19 Without beginning, middle, end, infinite in Power,
 Numberless arms, the sun and moon Thy eyes,
 Thee I behold, with mouth of gleaming fire,
 With Thy own glow searing this Universe.

20 Spanning both Earth and Heaven—their amplitude
 Thou fillest with Thyself, in every breadth.
 Seeing Thee thus, wondrous and dread of Form,
 The triple World, O Mighty One, is filled with awe.

21 Humbly the hosts of gods draw nigh to Thee,
 In fear stand others here with folded hands.
 All Hail to Thee! cry *Siddhas* and the sages,
 Hymning Thy praise, all glorious, in their songs.

22 All that's in Heaven and Earth, the clouds and winds,
 All life in air and sea, spirits and gods,
 Demons and *Siddhas*, ancients, wondrous beings,
 Thee they behold, standing in fixed amaze.

23 Colossal, many mouthed and many eyed,
 Unnumbered arms and legs, and feet and bodies,
 Bristling with horrid fangs, Thee the World sees,
 And stands, Lord, filled with horror, as do I!

24 Reaching to Heaven, in many colours glowing,
 As there Thou standest, opening wide Thy mouths,
 Thy great eyes rolling!—I am seized with terror.
 My courage fails, I am o'erwhelmed, O Vishnu.

25 Bristling with horrid fangs Thy mouths,
 Like to the flames consuming all the World.
 Where shall I flee! No shelter can I find.
 Be gracious, Lord of gods, Thou World sustainer.

26 The sons of Dhritarāshtra
 With all their hosts of warriors of the kings,
 Bhīshma and Drona, Karna of the foe,
 And of our own force all the finest heroes,

27 In swiftest march!—Behold Thy fangs protruding!
 How terrible Thy mouths, shutting and opening!
 Heads crushed to pieces, there they are displayed,

Pressed tight between Thy teeth, suspended there.

28 Like as the streams of water, hurried onwards,
Flow ever rushing downwards to the Ocean,
So stream the heroes from the world of men,
Into Thy mouths, glowing all round with fire.

29 As moths into the fierce flame of the lamp
Impetuously swarm, to be destroyed,
So crowd into Thy throats, to be destroyed
Therein, the multitudes of men.

30 For ever licking with thy flaming mouths,
Thou dost devour them on all sides alike.
Thy fearful glow scorches the utmost reaches,
Filling the Universe with flame, O Vishnu!

31 Tell me, O Thou of dreadful Form, Who art Thou!
Never can I conceive of Thy appearing.
I do adore Thee, Prince of gods. Be gracious!
Fain would I understand Thee, source of all.

32 *The Supreme:*
Kāla am I, Destroyer, great and mighty,
Appearing here all men to sweep away.
And, without thee, would none of all these warriors,
Here in their ranks arrayed, ever remain.

33 Therefore arise, win glory, smite the foe,
Enjoy thy lordship in prosperity.
By Me alone have they long since been routed,
BE THOU NOUGHT BUT MY TOOL, thou dexterous one.

34 Drona and Bhishma too, and Jayadratha,
And Karna with the others strong in battle,
By Me already slain, slay thou. Be void of fear,
Thine enemies thou shalt vanquish.—Fight thou on.

35 *Samjaya:*

Hearing Kēsava's words, trembling and shuddering,
Clasping his hands, and humbly worshipping,

The bearer of the crown thus spake to Krishna,
Stammering and fearful, bowing down to Him.

36 *Arjuna:*

Rightly, O Hrishikeśa, at Thy praises
The Universe is gladdened and rejoices.
Demons in terror seek the farthest spaces,
While hosts of *Siddhas* to Thee do obeisance.

(*A Gloss?*):

37 Wherefore, O Great One, should they not bow down,
Primal Creator, Thou, more sacred e'en than *Brahma*,
Infinite, Lord of gods, the World containing,
The *Aksharam*, Being, Non-Being, and yet more.

38 Primeval God art Thou, the ancient Primal Spirit,
The supreme treasury of this Universe,
Knower, and known, Thou art the Highest State.
The All pervading, infinite in Form.

39 Vāyu art Thou, Yama and Agni, Moon,
Thou art Varuna, Prajāpati and *Brahmā*,
Reverence to Thee, reverence a thousandfold,
Reverence again to Thee, profounder reverence.

40 Before Thee reverence, and behind Thee reverence,
From all sides to Thee, Thou Who art the All,
Infinite Power, unmeasured Energy,
The All pervading, the All therefore art Thou.

41 Howe'er unseemly Thee I may have hailed
As comrade:—"O Krishna! Yādava, O Friend!"
Heedless expressions, or e'en too familiar,
Forgetful of this Majesty of Thine,

42 Whate'er in jest I have spoken with irreverence,
Wand'ring or resting, sitting down or eating,
Alone with Thee, or in another's presence,
For that I crave Thee pardon, boundless Oue.

43 Father art Thou of all that moves, or moves not,
Most ven'rable, the World's reverèd *Guru*,
None is like Thee, much less is there a greater!
In the three Worlds Thy Power hath no equal.

44 Therefore I bow, casting myself to earth,
 I would appease Thee, Lord, and worship Thee.
 As fathers sons, friends, friends,¹ and as do lovers
 To those they love, O God, deign Thou to pardon.

45 Rejoiced to see what ne'er hath yet been seen,
 Still is my mind with fear quite overwhelmed.
 Show me again, O God, Thine ancient Form.
 Be gracious to me, Lord of gods, World Orderer.

46 Wearing the diadem, holding mace and discus,
 As erst Thou wert, may I again behold Thee.
 That Form, four-armed One, manifest anew,
 O thousand-armed, O Figure universal.

47 *The Supreme Exalted One:*

Gracious to thee, have I this Highest Form
 Shown thee, Arjuna, through My wondrous Power,
 Flaming and infinite, primeval, universal,
 Except by thee ne'er seen before by any.

48 By *Vedas*, sacrifice, study or gift of alms,
 By ritual, or e'en by gruesome penance,
 No one save thee, in all this world of men,
 Can see Me in this Form, O best of *Kurus*!

49 Be not distressed, be not thyself bewildered,
 At thus this awful Form of Mine beholding.
 From fear released, with joyful mind, behold Me
 Again, and in that Form beheld aforetime.

50 *Samjaya:*

Thus to Arjuna, "Yea," spake Vāsudeva,
 And showed Himself anew in ancient Form.
 So the Supreme consoled the terror stricken,
 In friendly aspect once again returned.

¹ [Sankara treats this word as feminine. Mr. M. M. Bose thinks that it shows the development in Sankara's time of the sexualism of later schools. See *The Post-Cartanya Sahajā Cult of Bengal*, p. 146, Calcutta, 1930.]

51 *Arjuna:*

Now that I see Thee again in friendly human form, O Janārdana, I have once more returned to my natural state of mind, and come to my senses again.

(*The Original Gītā* is resumed in XVIII. 58.)

(TREATISE I—XI. 52—XII. “*Dharmyānirritam.*” A Treatise on *Prapatti-Bhakti.*)¹

52 *The Supreme:*

Very hard to see is this My Form, which thou hast beheld; even the *devas* yearn continually (but vainly) for the vision of this Form. 53 Not through the *Vedas*, not through austerity, not through almsgiving, and not through sacrifice, can I be seen thus, as thou hast seen Me. 54 But by undivided BHAKTI can I be thus known and seen in reality and entered.

(1): 55 He who does My action, he who turns towards Me as to his highest goal, who is My BHAKTA, [devoted to Me], free from attachment (to things of sense), without hatred to any being, he comes to Me, O Pāndava.²

XII

[DEVOTION]

(II): I *Arjuna:*

Which of the two is the more devout: those who in unbroken composure worship Thee as *bhaktas*, or those who worship the inconceivable *Aksharam* (*Brahman*)? [the imperishable, the unmanifested].

¹ On the general character of this Treatise, and also the specifically religious type of *Prapatti-Bhakti*, cf. pp. 164 ff., 173 ff.; further, pp. 298, 300, with regard to the preceding Theophany, and on *Dharmyānritam.*

² [This verse is called by Śankara “the essence of the whole *Gītā-śāstra*.”]

2 *The Supreme:*

He who, filled with the deepest faith, places his mind in Me and worships Me in unbroken composure, I deem to be the best trained (the most devout). 3 But he who worships the *Aksharam* as the “indefinable”, as the “unmanifested equally as the all-present”, as the “unthinkable”, as the “absolute, immovable, stable”, (and in accord with the other speculative ideas of *Brahman* theology), 4 firmly restraining the troop of senses, maintaining equanimity (whatever befalls) and delighting in the good of all beings,¹ (in the end) he attains to Me alone, 5 but greater is the trouble of those whose minds are thus attached to the abstract, for such an abstract way is hard to attain by beings who are burdened with corporeality.

(III): 6 Whereas he who, casting all actions upon Me (the concrete and comprehensible God), turns to Me and worships Me, while he meditates upon Me in unbroken composure, 7 such a one, whose mind is placed wholly in Me, shall I straightway raise on high (with no toil nor intermediate states) from the ocean of death and *Samsāra*. 8 Set thy mind on Me alone therefore (and not on the *Aksharam*), place thy feelings in Me; in Me, Myself, shalt thou dwell hereafter, there is no doubt.

9 But if thou canst not concentrate thy mind firmly on Me in this way, then by the methodical practice of *Yoga* strive to reach Me.

10 But if thou art incapable of such practice, then be zealously intent on doing “My action”, for if thou dost perform “the actions that are appointed for Me”,² thou wilt attain success.

11 If thou art unable to do even this, then (simply) take

¹ That is if he is no mere speculator, but also practises the Ethics of the *Brahman* way. [Both these classes worship the One, the imperishable, but the former are those who know that the One is the Lord.]

² That is the acts of ritual service; cf. p. 299.

thy refuge¹ in My (saving) wondrous Power,² and practise hereafter³ (and in virtue of this complete resignation to My Power) in self-control the abandonment of the fruit of all action.

(iv): 12 For better is knowledge than *Yoga* technique, but far more excellent than knowledge is the devout mind.⁴ For from the devout mind⁵ there springs (spontaneously) the abandonment of the fruit of action, and close upon this abandonment of the fruit of action follows peace of soul.⁶

(v: The *sannyāsin* Ideal of *Bhakti*.)

13 He who is without hatred to any being, who is friendly and compassionate therewith, free from selfishness and arrogance, level-minded in weal and woe, 14 patient, ever content, a firmly resolute *yogin*,⁷ self-controlled, with heart and mind dedicated to Me, *My bhakta*—he is dear to Me.

15 He by whom the world is not provoked, and who is not provoked by the world, who is free from joy, anger, fear, emotion—he is dear to Me.

16 Expecting nothing, pure, strong willed, impartial, ever undaunted, remote from all undertakings, *My bhakta*—he is dear to Me.

17 He who concerns himself neither in favour of anything, nor is averse from anything, who desires nothing for himself,

¹ This is the *Bhakti* stage of *Prapatti*; cf. p. 174.

² cf. p. 117.

³ Note *tatas* here.

⁴ On *dhyāna* (meditation) as *Bhakti-Prapatti* cf. p. 174. The pious disposition exists whenever man resigns himself wholly to the redeeming Power of God.

⁵ The Ablative, to indicate the reason; cf. *tatas* in v. 11.

⁶ [The abandonment of actions is best, since when done completely it brings to the goal. Meditation is lower, for it is only a means. Knowledge, in the sense of knowledge of what the goal is, is lower still, for meditation has not yet begun, and still lower is exercise, which may be begun without any knowledge of the true goal.]

⁷ In view of all that has been said previously, this can virtually be stated in *Bhakti* terms as “the thoroughly converted pious man”.

and no longer questions as to good and bad, *My bhakta*—he is dear to Me.

18 He who is the same to foe and friend, honour and dis-honour, to heat and cold, maintaining equanimity in pleasure and pain, and freed from attachment, 19 silent whether praised or blamed, even-minded, content, whatever may befall, without a home, firm in faith and *filled with Bhakti*—he is dear to Me.

20 But he who sincerely follows this “excellent law”, as it is here proclaimed, devoted to Me in *bhakta* faith—he is dearest of all to Me.

XIII

[THE FIELD AND THE KNOWER OF THE FIELD]

(TREATISE IV—XIII. *Sa-Īśvara-Sāṅkhya.*)¹

I The Supreme:

(i): This (physical) body is called “the field”; and that which knows it (the spiritual subject) is called, by those who understand, “the knower of the field”.²

(A Gloss):

2 Know too that I am the Knower of the field with regard to all fields. Knowledge of the field and of the Knower of the field, that is knowledge indeed, I deem, (of what it concerns).

3 Hear now from Me in brief (a) What the field is and how it is formed, what its changes are and whence it is, and (b) Who the Knower of the field is and what His *Power* is.

¹ As with *Yoga*, here *Sāṅkhya* associated with Īśvara; cf. p. 191.

² [Some MSS. insert the following as the first verse: Arjuna said: Nature and the Person, the field and the knower of the field, this I wish to know, and also knowledge and that which should be known, O Keśava.]

(*A Gloss*):

4 The *rishis* have often divided it and expounded it in different sacred songs and also in the *Brahma-Sūtras*,¹ which, being accompanied by argument, are fully confirmed.

(a): 5 The field with its transformations is described thus: undeveloped primal Matter, *buddhi* (emanating therefrom), the principle of the self, the (five) great elements, the ten faculties (in the form of the five perceptual senses and the five demonstrative capacities), the one (*manas*) [(mind)], and the five fields of the senses, 6 also (motives) for inclination and aversion, pleasure and pain, and the combination (of all these factors) as the foundation of (empirical) consciousness.

(b): 7 "Knowledge"² is described as: humility, honesty, forbearance, pity, uprightness, readiness to serve the teacher, purity, strength of character, self-restraint, 8 freedom from passion for the objects of sense and from self-sufficiency likewise, insight into the evils of birth, death, old age, sickness, pain, 9 hating nothing, freedom from attachment to son, wife, home, invariable equanimity whether events are desired or undesired, 10 unchanging *Bhakti* to Me in unbroken concentration, sojourning in lonely places, dislike for the company of men, 11 constancy in the knowledge of the true self, insight into the object of knowledge of the real.—Whatever is different from this

¹ [This is the name of the authoritative work of the *Vedānta* system, in which the principles are stated in *sūtras* (short aphoristic statements), but these *sūtras* as we now possess them mention Buddhist and other doctrines certainly later than *The Song*. The name *Vedānta*, "end of the *Vedas*", probably existed earlier than the system as a name for the teaching of the *Upanishads*, as in xv. 15.]

² This is the "Power" of the Knower of the field, which according to v. 3 was to be described. The abstract *jñāna* of pure *Sāṅkhya* is here edifyingly reinterpreted and expanded by *Sa-Īśvara-Sāṅkhya*. Certainly this involves no "transitional stage" of *Sāṅkhya* as such, but rather the attraction, into the sphere of theology, of abstract concepts that have originated elsewhere.

jñāna, (or contrary thereto) is described as *ajñāna* [ignorance]

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

12 What that which should be known is, I will declare to thee: whoso has understood this has attained freedom from death. It is the supreme *Brahman*, without beginning, which is called Being and Non-Being. 13 With hands and feet, with eyes, head and vision, with hearing, on all sides it abides in the world enveloping everything.

14 Appearing with all the senses and attributes, still it is (in truth) free from all the senses (and attributes), in contact with nothing, it still supports everything; without *gunas*, still it is the enjoyer of the *gunas*, 15 inside and outside beings, immovable and yet movable, through its subtlety imperceptible, abiding far away, nevertheless most closely near; 16 not divided in itself, it abides in beings as though it were divided. It should be known as the supporter, but also as the devourer and the generator (anew). 17 Light of lights, exalted over darkness it is called. As the Knower, as the object of knowledge, as attainable by knowledge, it abides concealed in all hearts. 18 Thus the field, knowledge and the object of knowledge have been shortly told. When My devotee has understood this, he attains to My mode of Being.

(II): . . . 19 Primal Nature and the Spirit,¹ know both as without beginning. Know too that the changes (products) and likewise the *gunas* which constitute these arise from (this) Primal Nature. 20 It is the ground of the possibility of activity (pertaining not to Spirit, but) to the product (of Nature) and its factors;² whereas Spirit is the ground of possibility of the enjoyment of weal as of woe. 21 For the Spirit, abiding in Nature, is the enjoyer of the *gunas* originating from Nature; when it is *attached* (in enjoyment) to these *gunas*, it is (constantly) reborn from the womb of good or bad mothers. 22 This supreme Spirit, (when

¹ These have been described, according to the "programme", in *vv. 4-6, 7-11*.

² Guilt arises not from the spirit, but from the body and the factors (of Nature) that produce it. (Garbe)

abiding) in this body, is called (by the learned): spectator, approver, supporter, enjoyer, the great Lord, the highest Self.

(iii, a): 23 He who thus knows the Spirit and Nature with its *gunas*, in whatever condition he may abide, is not born again.

(b): 24 Some (the contemplative) know this Self (that is, this Spirit) in Itself, by means of Itself,¹ others know It by means of the (intellectual) *Sāṅkhyā* method, others again by means of *Karma-Yoga* [*Yoga* of action].² 25 And yet others, unable to attain knowledge *for themselves* in any of these ways, *hear* from others about the Self and dedicate themselves to Him; but they also overcome death, if only they be wholly intent upon the doctrine.

(c): 26 Now know that whatever creature arises, immutable or mutable, arises through the union of this "field" with "the Knower of the field". . . .

(*A Gloss*):

27 The highest Lord that abides in all beings alike, that perishes not in the perishable—he who sees Him thus sees truly. 28 For he who sees the Lord in all beings alike, smites not the Self through the self,³ and hence he goes the highest way.

. . . 29 and that all actions whatsoever are produced only by Nature. He who thus sees the Self as a non-actor, sees truly. . . .

(*A Gloss*):

30 He who sees the separate existence of beings abiding in

¹ That is to say, through the *direct* consciousness of the self about itself that emerges in contemplation, and without the intermediacy of the *anumāna* reflection of *Sāṅkhyā* (inference), or the technique (*Karma*) of *Yoga*.

² [The three methods of reaching the goal are here referred to as *Yoga*; *Yoga*-practice proper, the *Sāṅkhyā* method of reflecting on the distinction between the self and Nature, and the method of abandoning the fruit of actions.]

³ This is confirmation of *ahimsā* (non-injury), by the identity of the *Brahman-Ātman* in the smiter as well as in the smitten.

ONE, and development (into separateness) as having originated from this (ONE), attains to *Brahman*

. . . 31 Because this Supreme Self is without beginning and without *gunas*, therefore it is changeless, and even when abiding in the body (which acts) it acts not and is not defiled. 32 (For) as space, extending everywhere, owing to its "subtlety" (that is to say, its immateriality), is not defiled (by what occurs in it), so also the self, although abiding in every portion of the body, is nevertheless not defiled. 33 As the one sun illuminates the whole world, so the Lord of the field illuminates His whole field.

(d): (*In summa*): 34 Even so they who, with the eye of knowledge, know the difference between the field and the Knower of the field, and (in this way possess the means for) the release (of the self) from the elements and (the whole of) Nature, go to the highest (goal).

XIV

[DISTINCTION OF THE THREE CONSTITUENTS]

(TREATISE II—XIV—XV. *Sa-Sāṅkhya-Bhakti.*)¹

i The Supreme Exalted One:

Again will I proclaim to thee the highest of knowledges, by possessing which all *munis* have attained from here the highest goal. 2 Whoso, sustained by this knowledge, has attained a mode of Being like Mine, is not reborn even at the (re)creation (of the Universe), nor need he fear at the dissolution of the Universe.

(i): 3 My womb is the great *Brahman*: therein I place the germ (of life). Thence is the arising of all beings. 4 (For)

¹ *Bhakti* and *Sāṅkhya* associated together, as with the earlier instances. On the general character and arrangement of this Treatise cf. pp. 177 ff.

whatever forms arise in all (separate) wombs, the great *Brahman* is the (primal) womb of them (all); but I am the Father (of them all), Who gives the seed. 5 From the (undeveloped) *Prakriti*, (the great *Brahman*), arise the three "strands" (*gunas*), called *sattvam*, *rajas*, *tamas*. They bind the changeless (spiritual) subject, which possesses the body, to the body. 6 Of these three "strands", *sattvam* is spotlessly pure, and therefore light-giving and healthy, but even it binds through its attachment to well-being, and also to knowledge. 7 Know that *rajas* is the principle of passionate desire; it creates the thirst (for pleasure) and adherence (to the objects of sense); it binds through adherence to action. 8 Know that *tamas* is generated from *ajñāna*,¹ and is what deludes all spiritual subjects; it binds through indolence, inertia and sloth. 9 *Sattvam* fastens (the spirit) to well-being, *rajas* to action, and *tamas* to indolence, since it veils *jñānam*.

10 *Sattvam* flourishes² when it gains the mastery over *rajas* and *tamas*, *rajas* when it overcomes *sattvam* and *tamas*, and *tamas* when it subverts *sattvam* and *rajas*. 11 When through all the doors of this body light shines—in the form of *jñāna*—then we know that "sattvam" has been strengthened. 12 Whenever "rajas" has been strengthened, there arise greed, the urge to activity, undertaking of actions, restlessness and all kinds of desire. 13 Whenever "tamas" has been strengthened, there arise (intellectual) darkness, inertia, indolence, delusion.

14 If the embodied one dies when *sattvam* is strong, he attains the spotless worlds of the "knowers of the highest".³ 15 If when *rajas* is strong, he is reborn among those "attached to action". If when *tamas* is strong, in the wombs

¹ *Ajñāna* is "not-knowledge" as the positive antithesis to *jñānam* and its clarity, with which, in principle and essentially, the spirit is endowed.

² With K.

³ In the *Siddha-loka*:—"the place of *siddhas*".

of the "bewildered".¹ 16 They say that the fruit of a good action pertains to *sattvam* and is spotless, the fruit of *rajas* is painful, and the loss of knowledge the fruit of *tamas*. 17 From *sattvam* knowledge is born, from *rajas* desire, from *tamas* indolence, delusion and likewise the loss of knowledge. 18 Those who abide in *sattva* go upwards, men of *rajas* remain in the middle, men of *tamas* go downwards because they succumb to the influence of the lowest of the *gunas*.

(ii): 19 But when he who has attained true vision perceives that there is no other actor than the *gunas*, and knows that which is higher than the *gunas* (that is, spirit), he attains My mode of Being. 20 Such an embodied one passes beyond these three *gunas*, which constitute the body,² and attains immortality, freed from the evil of birth, death and old age.

21 *Arjuna:*

Which characteristic marks does he bear, O Lord, who has thus passed beyond these three *gunas*? What is his conduct? And how does he surmount these?

22 *The Supreme:*

Whoso is not attached to brightness (the fruit of *sattva*), nor to activity (the fruit of *rajas*), nor delusion (the fruit of *tamas*), when these exist, nor to longing when they do not exist, 23 whoso, sitting as one who is indifferent, is untouched by any of the *gunas*, whoso remains free from agitation, and thinks that "it is only the *gunas* that are operating", 24 calm in pleasure as in pain, continuing firm within himself, to whom a stone, wood and gold are the same, to whom the pleasant and unpleasant are equal, wise, to whom praise of himself and blame are equal,

¹ Animals?

² Therefore, too, beyond all corporeality.

25 untrammelled by fame or shame, by parties of friends or foes, by all undertakings—he is called “one who has surmounted the *gunas*”.

26 But he (truly) surmounts these *gunas* who serves Me in *Bhakti* discipline and without erring, and is thus fit for the *Brahma* mode of Being. 27 For upon Me reposes *Brahman*, and likewise the changeless immortality, the eternal law and absolute happiness.

XV

[THE LORD AS THE HIGHEST PERSON]

(III): 1 *The Supreme*:

An ancient legend tells of a fig-tree¹ with roots above, its branches below, unchanging, its leaves the songs of the *Vedas*; he who knows this correctly knows the *Vedas*.

(*Thus runs the old legend*):

2 “Some upwards and some downwards stretch its branches, swollen with the *gunas*,² whereupon ‘things’ grow.

While downwards again (new) roots³ are clinging,
Sprouting to action in the world of men.

¹ [This is the *asvattha*, the pipal, *Ficus religiosa*. It is not likely that the author confused it with the *nyagrodha*, the banyan, *Ficus indica*, which sends roots down from its branches. This is an inverted tree, and the image is taken from *Katha Up.*, vi. 1, where it means “Brahma, the immortal”, but here it is the world of rebirth (*samsara*), which is to be cut down by attaining complete severance from it.]

² The *guna sattva* leads upwards again, while *rajas* and *tamas* lead still farther downwards; cf. xiv. 18.

³ This fact is borrowed from the *nyagrodha*, the branches of which produce additional fresh roots (aerial roots).

3 Its¹ (evil nature) in this world² none knoweth,
 Neither its end, its origin nor sustainer.³
 Cut down the tree, and root so far outgrowing,
 With the stout sword of being attached to nothing.

4 Then can be seen the pathway to that place
 To which when men have gone they ne'er return;
 Then man can reach th' eternal primal Spirit,
 Whence sprang of old the Universe's motion.

5 From pride and erring free, faulty attachment conquered,
 Firm the true self within, free from all joys,
 Free from the pairs that men call 'weal' and 'woe',
 They go un'wildered to th' eternal place,'⁴

6 Which neither sun nor moon nor fire illumines.⁵
 Who reacheth this returneth nevermore.
 This place is My supreme abode.

(iv): 7 A portion of Myself, eternal (like Myself), becomes an individual soul in the world of souls. This (forcibly) draws to itself the (five) senses that pertain to Nature, with *manas* as the sixth. 8 Imperiously it grasps these, and when it enters into the body or leaves the body, it takes them with it as the wind (sweeps away) scents from their receptacle and carries them with it.

9 Thus by hearing and seeing, touching and tasting, smelling and *manas*, the soul is involved in the service of sense-objects. 10 When it (appears) in association with the *gunas*, either as emerging from these, or sojourning within them or enjoying them, the deluded know it not in its essence (as a part of the eternal God). But they who have

¹ The tree.

² Those who are involved in *Veda* actions or ritual, who by their songs assist the *Samsāra* tree instead of hewing this down.

³ This consists in adherence to objects.

⁴ This is the end of the ancient legend, and the author resumes his comments.

⁵ But only God Himself. The writer connects an ancient *Upani-shad* saying to the old strophes in *Upendravajra* verses.

the eye of *jñāna* know it, 11 and verily *yogins*, who are striving and taking pains, perceive it as abiding in themselves. But they who have not attained, (through *Yoga*), to self-conquest, perceive it not even though they strive. . . .

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

12 The brilliance which is in the sun and illumines the whole world, the brilliance in the moon and in fire, that know as My brilliance. 13 Having entered into them, I support the Earth, and beings, with My Power, and as *soma*, the strength-giving juice, I cause all plants to sprout. 14 Having entered, as fire, into the body of living beings, I cook (digest) food of the four kinds, united with the in-breath and the out-breath.

15 I sojourn in all hearts, and from Me come
Memory and knowledge, victory over doubt.
Alone am I the object of all *Vedas*. I alone
Made the *Vedānta*.¹ The *Veda* I created.²

. . . 16 In the world, therefore, there are these two subjects just described: the mutable and the immutable; “mutable” are all beings (and modes of Nature); the “immutable” is the sublime (spirit) (higher than Nature). 17 But the highest Subject is wholly another: He is called the HIGHEST SELF, Who as eternal Iśvara supports the threefold World, since He enters therein. 18 Since I (Iśvara) am beyond the “mutable”, (Nature), and also exalted high above the “immutable”, (that is to say, the world of souls), hence am I praised as the HIGHEST SPIRIT.

(v): 19 But he who, having become absolutely free from all delusion, knows Me thus as the “HIGHEST SPIRIT”, possesses complete knowledge, and cleaves to Me therefore with his whole soul.

20 Thus have I declared to thee this highest secret doctrine. Whoso understands this may verily be called intelligent. He has done what (alone) has to be done.

¹ [Or, the maker of the end of the *Vedas*; see note on XIII. 4.]

² *vedakṛit*, with K.

XVI

[DISTINCTION OF THE GODLY AND THE UNGODLY]

(TREATISE III—XVI-XVIII. 57. (A): A Naïve Religio-Moralistic Dualism.)

(a): 1 *The Supreme Exalted One:*

Fearlessness, essential purity, being steadfastly armed with wisdom, generosity, self-control, sacrifice, study, austerity, uprightness, 2 forbearance, veracity, freedom from anger, renunciation, peace of mind, absence of slander, compassion towards (all) creatures, absence of greed, mildness, modesty, constancy, 3 energy, patience, valour, (inward and outward) purity, freedom from hatred and undue self-estimation are his, who is born to a *devic* [godly] state. 4 Deceit, pride and arrogance, anger, insolence and folly are his, who is born to an *asuric* [ungodly] state. 5 Man knows that the *devic* (godly) leads to release, but the *asuric* (demonic) to bondage. Grieve not, O Pāndava, for thou wast born to the *devic*.

(b): 6 There are two classes of beings in the world: the *devic* and the *asuric*.¹ I have already described the former in detail (in vv. 1-3): hearken moreover about the *asuric*. 7 The *asuric* men are they who understand neither action nor non-action.² Purity, good conduct and veracity are not found among them. 8 They maintain (false doctrines, such as that) the world is without reality, without a (supermundane) support, without a divine Lord, without law-

¹ The “Parsiistic” dualism of this standpoint should be observed, in contrast with the triadism of the following Treatise.

² [This is Śankara’s interpretation. The terms usually refer to the evolution and dissolution of the world, but the ethical sense is more probable in this context, as also in xviii. 30.]

governed sequence,¹ nothing whatever occurs except in so far as lust produces it. 9 Going astray owing to this madness, fools, they commit outrages, injuring the world, evil. 10 Indulging in insatiable desire, full of deceit, arrogance and frenzy, deluded, they form insane ideas and conduct themselves like people of impure morals. 11 Committing themselves to unbounded designs,² which lead to ruin, engaged solely in enjoying pleasure and firmly convinced (moreover) that this is right, 12 entangled in a hundred snares of desire, entirely subjected to lust and anger, they strive unjustly for the accumulation of possessions, in order to indulge in enjoying pleasures. 13 Blinded by their folly (they form plans): "This have I gained to-day, that pleasure I shall attain to-morrow. Now I have this treasure, and (soon) I shall have that. 14 I have already slain that enemy, and now I shall slay the other too. I have become a lord, I live in enjoyment, I am a successful man, I am strong and happy; 15 I am wealthy and eminent. Who else is like me! Now I will celebrate sacrificial festivals,³ I will give alms, I will rejoice." Thus they say, blinded by folly. 16 Completely intoxicated by who knows what intentions, entangled in the snares of folly, fettered by the enjoyment of pleasure, they fall into foul Hell. 17 Self-conceited, stubborn, full of the frenzy of wealth and fame, their sacrifices are sacrifices merely in name, because they are performed with hypocrisy and against the law. 18 Cherishing self-seeking, violence, pride, lust and anger, and full of malice, they hate Me in their own and in others' bodies. 19 Such cruel men, hating Me, evil, the lowest, I throw repeatedly, in the course of their soul migrations, into *asuric* wombs. 20 Having fallen into

¹ [That the world in its evolution from Nature is produced by such combination of one thing with another is the *Sāṅkhya* view.]

² As in *v. 13*; cf. *v. 16*.

³ Like the lordly *yajamānas* (sacrificers).

these, and (ever more) deluded in each new existence, receding ever farther from Me, thereafter they go the lowest way of all. 21 Threefold is this self-destruction: lust, anger and greed. They are the gates of Hell. Therefore should one avoid these three. 22 The man who has freed himself from these three, as the gates of darkness, achieves salvation for himself. Hence he goes the highest way. 23 But he who neglects the rule of holy writ,¹ who lives according to his own desires, attains neither the goal, nor happiness, nor the highest way. 24 Therefore let holy writ be established as thy standard of what thou shouldst do or leave undone. Learn what action is prescribed for thee, and do it here.

XVII

[DISTINCTION OF THE THREE FORMS OF FAITH]

(B: Ancient Philosophical Doctrines, Based on the Schema of the Three *gunas*, Concerning Faith, Dietetic Regulations, Sacrificial Ritual, Asceticism, Almsgiving, Spiritual *Sannyāsa*, Knowledge, Action and the Doer, Judgment and Firmness, Happiness and *Svadharma*.²)

1 Arjuna:

Now what is the position of anyone who does not live in accord with the rule of holy writ, but is nevertheless filled with faith?³ Is it *sattva*, or *rajas*, or *tamas*? [of goodness, passion, or dullness?].

¹ [Śāstras, the śāstras are “teaching books”, especially the *dharma*-śāstras giving rules and instructions on ritual, ethics, and religion. The Song speaks of its own teaching as *śāstra* in xv. 20]

² The specific caste duty.

³ *vartante*, instead of *yajante*, with K.

(1): 2 *The Supreme:*

(*Faith*): Threefold is faith, since it originates from the specific nature of living subjects (which itself is threefold), being of the type of *sattva*, *rajas*, or *tamas*. Hearken thereto. 3 The faith of everyone is in accordance with his own nature, since faith pertains to the essence of the man himself; he himself is like what he has faith in (and to which he sacrifices). 4 Whoso is himself of the *sattva* type sacrifices to the *devas* (who pertain to *sattva*); he of the *rajas* type to the *yakshas* and *rakshases*,¹ (pertaining to *rajas*), and he of the *tamas* type to ghosts and spirits (who pertain to *tamas*).

(*Transposed lines*): 5-6 Know those to be people of *asuric* convictions who practise excessive mortification, not prescribed by the scriptures, fettered by hypocrisy and arrogance, abandoned to the violence of lust and passion, foolishly tormenting the host of elements in their body and Me also, for I abide in the inner parts of their body.

(2: *Diet, Sacrificial ritual, Asceticism, Almsgiving*): 7 Likewise (in accordance with the specific type of being), each one distinguishes the food, the sacrificial actions, the asceticism and the almsgiving that appeal to him. Hear their differences.

(*Diet*): 8 To the *sattva*-type appeal foods which increase vigour, vitality, strength, health, well-being and comfort: tasty, nourishing, tender, agreeable.

9 By those of the *rajas*-type foods are desired which are bitter, sour, salty, hot, sharp, pungent, burning; they cause discomfort, grief and sickness. 10 To those of the *tamas*-type appeals what is stale² and has lost its flavour, putrid and decayed, also what remains of the leavings (of others' food) or is ritually impure.

(3: *Sacrificial ritual*): 11 Sacrifice is of the *sattva*-type which is performed in accordance with precept and by

¹ Sometimes evil, and at other times friendly, demons.

² Which has been kept overnight.

those who do not long for the fruit, but direct their intention solely to: "Sacrifice must be done". 12 Know that sacrifice to be of the *rajas*-type when one sacrifices with a view to the fruit or in order to do something great thereby. 13 Sacrifice is described as of the *tamas*-type which violates precept, omits distribution of food, lacks sacred formulas and gifts (to the priests), without faith.

(4: *Asceticism*): 14 Serving the gods and brahmans, teachers and the wise, purity, uprightness, chastity and forbearance are called bodily asceticism. 15 Speech which does not offend others, which is truthful, pleasant and useful, and also reciting holy writ, are called asceticism in word. 16 Serenity of mind, a friendly disposition, taciturnity, self-control, purity of heart, are called spiritual asceticism. 17 This threefold asceticism, if practised in complete faith by men who, longing not for the fruit, possess self-command, is described as being of the *sattva*-type. 18 Asceticism which is practised in order to gain favourable treatment, honour and the show of service, or in order to boast about this, has here¹ been shown to be of the *rajas*-type; it is unsteady and without constancy. 19 Asceticism which arises from foolish ideas and with self-torture, or in order to injure others (by means of having supposedly acquired magical power), is described as of the *tamas*-type.

(*The transposed lines of vv. 5, 6, presumably appeared here.*)²

(5: *Almsgiving*): 20 That alms is deemed to be of the *sattva*-type which is given solely with the thought. "Alms must be given", and given to one who can make no return, and this at the right place, the right time and to a worthy recipient. 21 But the alms is shown to be of the *rajas*-type, which is given for the sake of a return (on the recipient's part), or with a sly eye to the fruit, or with vexation. 22 Alms given at the wrong place, at the wrong time, to

¹ That is in the doctrine of the three *gunas*

unworthy recipients, in an unfriendly or contemptuous spirit, is called of the *tamas*-type.

(*A Gloss of the Brahman Theologian*):

23 OM, TAT, SAT—this is declared to be the threefold designation of *Brahman*.¹—By *Brahman*² were the *Vedas* and the sacrifice prescribed of old, 24 therefore the orthodox³ always perform the acts of sacrifice, almsgiving and asceticism only after first of all saying OM. 25 TAT⁴ means that the various acts of sacrifice and asceticism, and likewise of almsgiving, are practised by those seeking liberation while their thoughts are fixed (only on *Brahman*) and not on the fruit. 26 Finally, SAT is employed in the sense of “true Being” and “goodness”; the word SAT is applied to “action replete with salvation”; 27 steadiness in sacrifice, asceticism and almsgiving is also designated by SAT; thus *action* that is allocated to such a goal can likewise be called SAT. 28 On the contrary, whatever sacrifice, or alms or asceticism is practised without faith is called ASAT, (this ASAT) yields fruit neither in this life nor after death.

XVIII

(SANNYĀSA)—[RENUNCIATION]

(6): 1 *Arjuna*:

I wish to know the specific nature of *Sannyāsa* and *Tyāga* [renunciation and abandonment].

(a): 2 *The Supreme*:

(Some) sages understand *Sannyāsa* to be the giving up of those actions that *arise from* desire; those endowed with insight define *Tyāga* as the neglect (of interest in) their

¹ [These terms are duly explained in the text. *Sat* is literally “existent”, *asat* “non-existent”. *Tat*, “that”, is specially used in the “great utterance” of the *Upanishads*, *tat twam asi*, “thou art that”, expressing the identity of the individual with *Brahma*.]

² *brahmanā*, with K.

³ The *Brahma-vidas*.

⁴ “*THAT*”, originally a mystical term for *Brahman*.

fruit as regards *all* actions. 3 Some scholars maintain that "action in general should be abstained from", because (essentially as action) it is defective. Others, again, teach that acts of sacrifice, almsgiving and asceticism should not be abandoned (perfect *Sannyāsa*, but with exceptions).

(b): 4 Hear now My own decision; *Tyāga* (like *Sannyāsa*) is expounded as being threefold (that is as being of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* type).

(*A Gloss?*):

5 Acts of sacrifice, almsgiving and asceticism should not be abandoned, for they are the means of purification for the intelligent, 6 but even these actions should be done while ignoring attachment (to action) and the fruit (of action). This is My decided and final teaching concerning this.

7 But renunciation of "indispensable action" should not be permitted, and the neglect of such action is described as of the *tamas*-type, because it is an error. 8 Whoso abstains from action, merely because he thinks it is difficult and fears hardship, practises *Tyāga* of the *rajas*-type; nothing is gained by such *Tyāga*. 9 But when one does an indispensable action purely from the conviction that "it must be done", and at the same moment ignores attachment (to action) and (its) fruit, that *Tyāga* is of the *sattva*-type. 10 A *tyāgin*, filled with *sattva*, rich in wisdom and freed from doubt, (is one who) has no aversion from unacceptable action nor inclination to what is acceptable, 11 (but not one who abandons action completely, since) no one, who is still in the body, can renounce action entirely. Rather is he, who practises the *Tyāga* of the *fruit* of action, called a *tyāgin*.

(*The fruit of action*):

12 Threefold is the fruit of action: unwished for, wished for, or compounded of both; it is granted only to the non-*tyāgin* after death, but not to the *sannyāsin*.¹

¹ Because, after death, the (genuine) *sannyāsin* attains not reward for works, but *moksha*—release.

(*A Sāṅkhya Gloss*):

13 Learn from Me, O Mighty-armed, the following five causes for the achieving of all actions: they have been established in the *Sāṅkhya-kṛitānta*:¹ 14 The basis, the doer, the organ, each in its own type, (their?) various separate functions, and as the fifth cause: Destiny.² 15 These five (and *not* the *ātman*) are the causes of every action, whether one undertakes it with the body, with the voice or with thought, whether right or wrong. 16 Since this is the truth of the matter, therefore the pure self is not the doer, and whoso looks upon it as the doer, owing to his defective insight, cannot see and is deluded. 17 But he whose mind is free from such a false attribution (of the status of a doer) to the *ego*, and whose strength of insight is unclouded, is not a doer, even though he has slain all these peoples, nor is he bound (by such slaughter).

(7 a: *The conditions of action*): -

18 Threefold too are the conditions of action: knowledge (of an object), the knowable (object) and the subject of knowledge [the knower]. Threefold also is that pertaining to the essence of action: the tool, action itself, and the actor. 19 Knowledge moreover, like action and actor, is divided into three classes by enumerating (and distinguishing) their attributes, in accordance with the classification in terms of the *gunas*. Harken, how this is done.

(b: *Knowledge*):

20 Know that that knowledge is of the *sattva*-type whereby one perceives one single Substance in all beings which, imperishable, exists undivided in divided (separate things). 21 Knowledge is of the *rajas*-type which imagines many qualitatively distinguished substances (simultaneously), in numerical individuality, in all beings. 22 Knowledge is designated as of the *tamas*-type which, adhering merely to one single (and isolated) product (of *Sat*), as if it were the

¹ The *Sāṅkhya* system and its "dogmas" (Hill).

² [In all human actions there is always an unaccountable element, luck, fate, destiny, providence, which the Hindus call *dava*, lit. "the divine".]

whole, does not enquire about the cause (and interconnection of the single products), nor about the one (highest) Reality, (subsisting at the basis of everything), but is attached strictly (to details and aspects).

(*Action*):

23 Action is called of the *sattva*-type which is done as being necessary, without attachment, and not from inclination nor aversion, by those who do not wish for the fruit; 24 that is of the *rajas*-type which is done by one who seeks pleasure and egotistically, with great effort; 25 that is of the *tamas*-type which is done from lack of deliberation, without regard to the consequent loss or injury and with no consideration for one's own capacity.

(*The Doer*):

26 The doer is called of the *sattva*-type who, free from attachment, speaking not of "I",¹ firmly and steadfastly remains himself unchanged in success as in failure; 27 he is called of the *rajas*-type who is passionate, seeking the fruit of action, greedy, violent, impure, moved by joy or sorrow. 28 He is of the *tamas*-type who, lacking self-control, is untrained, stubborn, cunning, dishonest, lazy, despondent, negligent.²

(*Buddhi*):

29 Hear too now—fully and in detail—the three classes of judgment and firmness, as these result from the *gunas*.

30 That judgment is of the *sattva*-type which understands (the distinction) between acting and refraining from acting, between what ought to be done and to be omitted, to be feared and not to be feared, between bondage and release; 31 that is of the *rajas*-type which does not understand right and wrong, what ought to be done and be omitted, as these must be; 32 that is of the *tamas*-type which, enveloped in darkness, sees wrong as right and all aims reversed.

¹ *anahamvādin*: egoist.

² *dirgha-sūtrin*, dilatory.

(*Firmness*):

33 That firmness is of the *sattva*-type by which one firmly curbs, with undivided composure, the breath, the senses and *manas*; 34 that is of the *rajas*-type with which, impelled by attachment and longing for the fruit of action, one holds firm to gainful action, and likewise to pleasure and profit. 35 That is of the *tamas*-type with which the fool does not give up sleep, fear, sorrow, despair and excitement (but "firmly" adheres to them).

(*Happiness*):

36 Happiness also is threefold. Hearken: of the *sattva*-type is happiness springing from the calm of one's own soul, where joy results from the foundation of (prolonged) *discipline*. Thus the cessation of pain is (actually) attained.

37 This (pure spiritual) happiness at first tastes bitter, but in its ripeness like ambrosia. 38 Happiness is called of the *rajas*-type which originates from contact between the senses and the objects of sense. At first it tastes like ambrosia, but in its ripeness is bitter. 39 That is of the *tamas*-type which arises from sleep, inactivity and indolence. (It is mere animal comfort and) at first, as in what follows, nothing but self-delusion.

(8: *Svadharma*):

40 Free from these three *gunas*, sprung from Nature—such a being can be found neither on Earth nor in Heaven among the *devas*, 41 and thus the actions, (connected with their status), of brahmans, *kshatriyas*, *vaiśyas* and *śūdras*,¹ (as determined by the *gunas*), are distinguished (from each other) according to the influence of the predominant *guna* of their specific nature. 42 Springing from his nature (of the *sattva*-type), the brahman's action is calm (in spirit), discipline, likewise² purity, forbearance,

¹ [The four castes of priests, warriors, the agricultural and trading class, and the servile class.]

² *taihā* in place of *tapas*, with K.

uprightness, knowledge, understanding and faith (in transcendent Reality and the goal of salvation)¹; 43 originating from his nature (compounded of *sattva* and *rajas*), the *kshatriya*'s action is heroism, superiority, firmness, strength of will, steadfastness in battle, almsgiving, the character of a ruler; 44 arising from his nature (compounded of *rajas* and *tamas*), the *vaiśya*'s action is agriculture, cattle rearing, trade; service is the action of the *śūdra*, springing from his nature (compounded of *tamas* and *rajas*).

(*A Gloss*):

45 By being devoted to his own (caste) action with joy a man attains the goal (in each of these castes). Hear how he finds the goal by being gladly devoted to *his proper action*:

46 When a man, with his proper action, worships *Him* from Whom beings come forth, and by Whom all is pervaded, he finds the goal.

(9): 47 Better is the fulfilment of one's own (caste) *dharma* [duty], even if imperfectly achieved, than of another's (caste) *dharma*, even if well performed. Whoso executes the (caste) action necessitated by his nature remains free from sin. 48 And even if that action, indicated by one's own nature, should involve evil, it should not be abandoned, for *all* undertakings are enveloped by evil (and this necessarily) as is fire by smoke.

(10): (*Conclusion*):

49 By *Sannyāsa* (that is to say, as we have seen) when one's mind is free from attachment as regards all things, when he is self-restrained and has been released from desire, he attains the *highest goal*, that is, *freedom from Karman*.

(C: Appendix by a *Bhakti* theologian, effecting the connection with *The Original Gitā* in vv. 56, 57.)

50 Understand now briefly from Me, how one who² "has attained the goal" likewise attains *Brahman*—which is the highest perfection of "wisdom".

¹ *āstikyam*.

² *cf. v. 49.*

51 Armed with a purified intellect, restraining the self by firmness, abandoning objects of sense such as sound (odour, etc.), casting away inclination and aversion, 52 abiding in a solitary place, enjoying only light fare, with speech, body and mind restrained, practising contemplation, cultivating steadfast detachment from passion, 53 relinquishing arrogance, violence, pride, lust, anger, desire for possessions, not egotistic, calm in soul, he is (specifically) fit for the "Brahman state". 54 Existing in that "Brahman state", (that is to say) having attained to peace of soul, he fears and desires no more, and having attained *equanimity* to all beings, (then) he wins the highest *love* to Me (*Bhakti*). 55 But through this *Bhakti*, moreover, he gains the *knowledge of Me*, Who in truth I am, and how great. But if one (thus) knows Me in truth, (finally) he comes, in consequence of this knowledge, forthwith to Me.

56 Even if one ever performs so many actions, nevertheless he attains the eternal, imperishable state, *trusting in Me* and through My *Grace*. 57 Therefore casting all actions, in spirit, on Me. O Bhārata,¹ and sustained by *Buddhi-Yoga*, ever have thy thought on Me.

(Resumption of *The Original Gītā*, interrupted at XI. 51.)

58 *The Supreme*:

Therefore direct thy *thoughts* to Me; then through My Grace thou shalt surmount all difficulties. But if, from arrogance, thou wilt not obey, thou shalt perish. 59 If (now), in thy self-sufficiency, thou thinkest that thou wilt not fight, this thy resolve is (also) vain: thy (martial) nature will constrain thee so to do. 60 For bound by the Power of Destiny, assigned to thee with thy nature, thou wilt do compulsorily what now through bewilderment thou dost not wish to do. 61 (But this

¹ Bhārata, in place of *matparah*, with K.

compelling power of thine own nature is nothing other than the operation of the Universal Activity; for) this God¹ abides in the heart of all beings and makes them move like puppets on the stage² by His magic Power. . . .

(*A Bhakti Interpolation*):

62 Flee to Him with thy whole soul. By His Grace thou shalt attain the highest peace, the eternal abode. 63 Thus have I taught thee knowledge, more secret than the secret. Ponder it deeply, and then do as thou wilt. 64 Yet hearken to My highest word, most secret of all; because thou art inviolably dear to Me, I will speak it to thee for thy salvation.

65 Have thy mind on Me, be My *bhakta*, sacrifice to Me, honour Me.

Then to Me thou shalt come. Verily, I swear it to thee: dear art thou to Me.

. . . . 66 Fret not thyself, therefore, because of all the "laws".³ (In thy "sorrow") take thy refuge in Me alone. I will free thee from all "sins". Abandon thy "sorrow". . . .⁴

(*A Bhakti Interpolation*):

67 This is never to be imparted by thee to anyone who is undisciplined, who is not a *bhakta*, who is not a student of the doctrine, or above all to one who is ill-willed towards Me.

68 But he who shall declare this highest secret to My *bhaktas* himself shows, in that way, the highest *Bhakti* to Me, and shall surely come to Me. 69 For no one among all men does what is dearer to Me than he, and no one on Earth shall be dearer to Me than he. 70 And if anyone will *study* this sacred discourse

¹ *esha*, with K:—This God, Who has just manifested Himself to thee

² [“Revolve mounted on a machine”: Śankara says, like wooden figures of a puppet-show]

³ [“Duties.” Śankara says that this includes wrong as well as right; it is “beyond good and evil”, not because moral distinctions are unreal, but because the devotee has reached a state beyond action.]

⁴ [This is called the “final verse” (*carama śloka*), and is looked upon by the school of Rāmānuja as containing the essence of *The Song*.]

between us two, that will be esteemed by Me as the *jñāna* sacrifice [sacrifice of knowledge]. 71 But whoso merely *hears* it, if only he has faith and is not opposed, is freed (from *Samsāra*) and attains the excellent worlds of men of good works.

(The Conclusion of *The Original Gitā*):

... 72 Hast thou heard this, O Pārtha, with attentive mind? Has thy perplexity disappeared, that sprang from ignorance?

73 *Arjuna*:

The perplexity has disappeared. By Thy Grace, O Acyuta, [Stable One], I have gained prudence.¹ I stand steadfast, freed from doubt. I will fulfil Thy command.

(Editorial Supplement):

74 *Samjaya*:

Thus did I hear this discourse between Vāsudeva and Pārtha, the exalted one. It is marvellous and causes one's hair to rise (with rapture). 75 Through the favour of Vyāsa I was granted this (supernatural) hearing (in order to understand) this supreme secret of *Yoga*, as the Lord of *Yoga*, Krishna, Himself directly proclaimed it. 76 Calling to memory again and again, O King, this marvellous sacred discourse between Keśava and Arjuna, I am ever enraptured anew, 77 and calling to memory again and again that exceeding marvellous (*Viśvarūpa*)²-form of Hari, great is my astonishment, and with it I am evermore enraptured. 78 Wherever Krishna is, the Lord of *Yoga*, and Pārtha, the bearer of the bow, there too—I deem³—are happiness and victory, prosperity and the leading (of the army) to certain (victory).

¹ Or "thought of Thee".

² The "all forms".

³ [These words make it clear that the meaning of *The Song* is much more than an incident in an ancient battle. The fight is ever present. Modern Indian thought finds in it an allegorical meaning, much as Dante describes the mystical interpretations of the *Commedia* (Ep. 17). The battlefield Kurukshetra is called *dharma-kshetra*, the field of right. There is the Lord, and there is the individual soul, fighting against the distractions of the several senses, till by means of *Yoga* it attains the light of knowledge.]

CHAPTER III

YOGA AND THE YOGINS

(1). A *yogin*, in the first place, is one who practises *Yoga*. Both of these terms, however, undergo a profound change of meaning, and acquire associations so diverse as fully to justify Hill's application of "chameleon" to the two words in *The Gītā*. The root of *Yoga*, in the first place, is *yuj*, which means "to bind together" two beasts of burden under the "yoke" (springing from the same root), or again "to bind together" a draught animal and the wagon:—hence "to yoke", "to harness". In magical cult practices, therefore, man could thus "yoke" or "harness" spirits or gods and utilize them for his own purposes, exactly as magician and priest both alike actually do. Similarly, and by employing the same ritual, a person's own psychic powers could be "yoked" so as to accumulate and enhance them, to bring them into operation, by asceticism, *tapas* (self-mortification) and magical practices. Whoever does all this then, and so achieves any powerful magical effects, is a "yoker", a *yogin*; and thus the word *yogin* gains the additional meaning of sorcerer or magician and, on a still higher level, of "wonder worker". In this sense, therefore, *Yoga* means magical and miraculous power, its utilization and its systematic cultivation. God, too, is *Yoga-Īśvara*, or in other words Lord of the marvellous *Yoga* Powers with which He creates and rules. Here then we must translate the term by "wondrous Power"—*madyoga*¹; and the significance of this magical and marvellous Power is connected with that of *Māyā*, while both terms can be combined in a hendiadys as *Yoga-Māyā*. The root of *Māyā*, again, is *mā*—"to prepare, form or build"—and originally means simply the capacity

¹ "My saving wondrous Power"; *The Gītā*, xii. 11; cf. p. 173.

to produce a "pattern, image or structure". But this word too acquires the higher, and now numinous, sense of "to produce by *occult* power, of a *supernatural* kind, some magical or miraculous result or effect", and then becomes at the same time a name for any supernatural product as such.

In this way therefore it becomes a name equally for the magical action of a sorcerer as for the miraculous act of a god, both of whom can be called *māyīn*; and thus, on the one hand, *Māyā* may be a name for exalted and divine miraculous activity and, on the other, for any quite commonplace magical operations. In itself, again, *Māyā* has no reference whatever to "illusion", deception or mere appearances. What is effected by *Māyā*, nevertheless, is never part of the *natural* order of events and possesses, therefore, no normally material nor physical character. It does not "exist" (that is to say) in the same way as natural objects "exist", and cannot be estimated in accordance with the "actuality" or "reality" pertaining to the Being of Nature, as is equally true, indeed, of the *Māyā* of the ordinary magician. Whatever he produces, then, is in fact a "deception";¹ but we should misunderstand all this entirely were we to confuse it with any modern theories of merely subjective illusions such as an expert psychologist can create by employing suggestion. On the contrary, *Māyā* events and objects are in themselves results that are wholly objective and can cause completely real effects in the world of things in general. Nevertheless this thoroughly objective "given" subsistence which they possess cannot be included in the same category as our own much later concepts of Being and Non-Being (*sadasadbhyām anirvacanīyām*—not to be defined as either Being or Non-Being); and this enables us to understand, still further, that by *Māyā* the noblest

¹ *cf. fingere* and "fiction"; *fingere*, too, implies actual formation, while "a mere fiction" is a deception.

divine and creative activity can be denoted on the one hand, which by recalling the word's original meaning, in the sense of forming and constructing, can be apprehended quite realistically, while (on the other hand) the term can also acquire the literal significance of magical juggling, of deception and illusion by means of demonic images, and finally of deception in general. It explains, too, that whenever divine creation is referred to and indicated by *Māyā*, it can often be characterized by a strange veil of the unreality, or semi-reality, of what has been created, while at the same moment God, Whose Omnipotence is on the one hand to be glorified by His *Māyā*, nevertheless also appears as the mysterious and enigmatic *Māyin* Who, by means of His own creative "play", simultaneously conceals Himself behind it, and to that extent "deceives". With this may be compared Luther's familiar dictum—*creatura est larva Dei*. Closely connected with this, too, is that characteristic dual estimation of the Universe, and of its essential nature and reality, appertaining to every form of the religious attitude towards the Universe, of which I have spoken in my *Mysticism East and West*, Chapter VIII, "Creature and *Māyā*".

(2). From the very earliest times, still further, *Yoga* has been employed in its *specific* sense to describe practices and experiences of a quite distinctive kind; and of these the most magnificent account is preserved in the *Sūka* legend. Originating in primitive practices which must have had a shamanist character, *Yoga* now becomes a methodically prearranged "harnessing" or "yoking" of the mind in order to penetrate to a transcendent experience, wherein the spirit tears itself away from its connection with the body so that, having thus become bodiless and free, it attains its own, as well as universal, infinity, rides on the wind and enters into ever higher, into even the highest, realms of Being and Essence, in order finally to achieve universal

experience. So it gains that “lordship” which, on the one hand, is inner freedom from all narrowness and restriction, and on the other the infinite fullness of its own being. The absolutely essential condition for this experience, again, is not systematic *thinking*, not any specific cultivation and acquirement of knowledge, but *Yoga* in its true and proper sense of the most forcible inner *harnessing* of the volitional capacity, directed towards suppressing all interests absorbed in external objects, the immobilizing and elimination of thought and the most intense concentration of the controlled will and its powers, whose goal is to force the way—to break through as it were—to transcendence. Whoever undertakes this is engaged in a dynamic “activity”, in an act of will which makes him a *jina*—a victor over all opposition and a conqueror of the transcendent enjoyment of salvation. The initiation of this “activity”, in principle, consists in a fundamental, persistent and unfailing *resolution* which, as a thoroughgoing and basal deed which transforms the whole inner being, is closely related on the one hand to the *teshūbāh* and the *metanoia* (return, in the sense of repentance) of the *Old* and the *New Testament*, and also with Kant’s radical postulation of Maxims.

✓ A brief summary of the legend just referred to may not be inapposite here: Śuka is the son of Vyāsa; and by the recounter of the story, who is a past master of narration, characterization and subtle irony, Vyāsa is depicted as the typical advocate of Vedic “knowledge and wisdom”. His own house is devoted to study and teaching, and there he trains his pupils, who subsequently become renowned, in Vedic sacrificial practice and speculation; his one motto is: “Study, study”. An excellent and most impressive sermon about repentance has induced his son, Śuka, who according to this exhortation must have been a sad rake, to follow the path leading to salvation; and then his father wishes to educate him to become a learned brahman. But Śuka

has loftier impulses. He is overcome by *niveda*—by that loathing for all *śrutam śrotavyam ca*, all Vedic pedantry and studiousness, which characterizes the *yogin*, and which *The Gītā* expresses in II. 52—its own passionate protest against Vedic sacrificial practice and against the Vedic ideal of the four “classes”, its revolt against the Brahmanic way of salvation because it does not lead “to the Highest, the Supreme”. So he leaves his father’s school and, as instructed by his parent himself, he goes to the wise king Janaka, the master of *Yoga*. Already he has attained the preliminary stages of *Yoga*, consisting in the renunciation of sensual pleasures and the things of sense; and now Janaka exhorts him to take the “resolution” on which everything depends: “For without *strenuous resolve* no one attains the Highest”. Then Śuka returns to his father, having made his final decision: “I desire not the worlds of the devas (gods) (in their ‘heavens’), but that highest state of Being from which there is no return (to this sorrowful *samsāra*); and only by Yoga is this highest path to be reached. But whoever practises *Yoga* has nought to do with the path of (Vedic) actions (and the whole Vedic ritual). Farewell, trees and elephants, stately mountains and celestial regions. I desire to enter into all Being and into all the worlds.” So he travels on into solitude, occupies the *Yoga* seat and “concentrates the self” in forcible restraint and suppression of all intellectual activity; and then dawns on him the most sublime vision of the marvellous secret of the “true Self” within his own self. “And Śuka broke out into jubilant laughter when he perceived this highest.” Then the “breaking through” occurs: and the spirit is freed from the fetters of the body “like an arrow-shaft out from a reed”.¹ And like the other great *yogin*, Gautama Siddhārtha Buddha, he too cries out in rapturous joy: “I have seen the way: I have ventured it”. Away on the wind he flies:

¹ *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, vi. 17 (Hume).

he ascends to Heaven. He attains "the state of perfection"—he attains, that is to say, the literal ideal of *Yoga*, and thus becomes a *siddha*. Stripping off all *gunas*, (constituents of Nature), he stands like smokeless fire. (The whole Universe shudders at the great miracle.) He becomes a "Universal Being, omnipresent, having the Universe as his own self".

(3). This state of perfection—*Siddhi*—is frequently called "*Brahman-existence*" in *Yoga* doctrine, as is the case in the *Śuka* legend also. Originally, however, primitive *Yoga* experience required neither the name nor the idea of *Brahman*; from the very beginning its ideal is neither *Brahman*, nor any god nor *the God*, but simply and solely to become a *siddha*; and even the oldest Hindu mythological tradition was quite familiar with *siddhas*. They held the same position as the *rishis*, the *pitrīs* (or *manes*), the *devas* and the *sādhyas*,¹ as *independent* and transcendent miraculous figures of primitive origin, great and marvellously powerful magical beings, who in the later systems too retained their peculiar transcendent status, being capable of producing mighty effects and enjoying the magic *aiśvaryam* or "lordship" over the world of the elements in the first place, while having escaped from the world, their mastery then includes dominance even over spirits and gods. Thus their *Siddhi* is an absolutely transcendent condition of delight and power, in itself wholly independent of "becoming *Brahman*" or of any ideas of God. And no matter how closely *Yoga* practices can adapt themselves, in accordance with the religious environment, to Brahmanic or theistic doctrines of salvation, still the ancient magical absolutist ideal of the *siddha* state, essentially characteristic of *Yoga*, cannot be *derived* from these doctrines themselves.

(4). But older even than the *Śuka* legend, with its markedly poetic style, is an ancient *Yoga* fragment describing

¹ The sages, fathers, gods and celestials.

the psychic and transcendent experiences of the original *yogin*. In a sadly fragmentary form it was incorporated in a representation of the *Upasarga*, or the subordinate creation which begins with the Demiurge *Brahma* subsisting in subservience to the divine original Principle, although it has no connection whatever with the *Upasarga* in itself. Evidently the editor himself was acquainted with it only in shreds which he has patched together in the most curious way. It is to be found in *Harivamśa*, xi. 696 *ff.* and runs:—

When by “wisdom”¹ the *yogin* has firmly suppressed the host of the five senses, desire, anger and confusion (arising through the play of thought), and has energetically² transported (his self) into his head, there arises first of all a great smoke glowing and coloured in blue and red, white and yellow, dove grey and crystal, with different tinted ingredients, suddenly rushing down over him as when great clouds accumulate. As though with winged mountain ranges the ether shrouds itself. These smoking and conglomerated masses bring with them floods, discharging them so that they penetrate the Earth’s interior. On his head there burns a spiritual—that is, immaterial—great and mighty fire. (Thus) the devotee of *Yoga* is surrounded a hundred-fold by rays, while from all his limbs spring forth hundreds and thousands of fiery sparks, flaming like the conflagration of the end of the world. As many flames blaze out as there are clouds, but they are extinguished by the waters flooding the Earth.

Out of the disciple’s ears³ rushes forth a great wind, produced by the host⁴ of heavenly *siddhas*, already per-

¹ We shall encounter this “wisdom” in detail at a later stage in the form of the practical wisdom of austere prudence and firm resolution.

² *Tejasā*, “power” or magical heat-energy, which here becomes the tense energy of will in general.

³ *Karnābhyām*.

⁴ *Gana* in place of *guna*.

fected, subtle,¹ strengthening the breath of life, tempestuous, raging frightfully, mighty and powerful, odorous like perfume. . . .

(Here the fragment is interrupted, but resumed in) —

xi. 717. Then from the great smoke comes a mass of cloud, and out of this the purest stream.

(After another hiatus there follows):—

xi. 738. Then the disciple gains the lordship (*aisvaryam*) over *ethereal space*, if, thus being in the *Brahman* state (here, that is to say, simply acting according to *Yoga*) he (persists) in (*Yoga*) *works*, which overcome all *vikāras*²—obstacles, that is, and inimical beings which hinder him. So he attains the wide airy space, pure and immutable, the assembly of all the orthodox who have existed.³ Having thus gained this dominion over ethereal space, he (at the same time) makes it a mastery over the wind, after having first of all been compelled to experience many “obstacles” (*vikāras*) which befall him; and when he has completely vanquished these hindrances confronting him, then he actually obtains his dominion permanently and becomes a *siddha*. Leaving the body, he courses along (on the wind)

¹ *Sūkshma*, subtle, as contrasted with the grossly material natural breeze.

² *Nirvikārena karmanā*. This term is significant. To *Yoga* there pertains a *Karma*; the *yogin* (that is to say) must not “think”, but must accomplish a mighty act of will. Thus the expression *nirvikārena karmanā* indicates in what sense *Yoga* is designated *Karma-Yoga*. The *vikāras* are demonic obstacles to be vanquished, while for later *Yoga* they become subjective personal impediments. But, for the *yogin*, *nirvikāram karma* remains a perennial necessity, cf. p. 206, and on *Karma-Yoga* pp. 130, 290.

³ A theological encounter of this kind with the *brahmavādins* would very probably interest the Brahmanic redactor of this ancient *Yoga Text*; but in the original, undoubtedly, the word *mahāsiddha*, or something similar, occurred—the *ganas*, the hosts of *divyāsiddhas*, being intended, who have appeared previously and who blew the strong, fragrant wind which strengthens the breath of life out of the ears of the struggling *yogin*; cf. n. 5, p. 50, and p. 125, n. 2.

in ethereal space as a pure spirit (*manasā*), with no support, and without even supporting himself on what has no support (the ether?), (but freely and independently). Enjoying this dominion, sailing (in the ether) and having become a pure *ātman* or “self”, he is invisible, even to those who are like Indra, with a thousand eyes.

XI. 754. Then he obtains *lordship over all that is moist*, when he has (once again) reached the end of (new) obstacles; for here too hindrances in terrible form afflict the noble-spirited disciples. They surround him with vast floods, so that he is distracted with terror; far around him are great waves, both cold and hot. Falling into the hot flood he is scalded, but he never sinks.¹ Great streams break over him: he sits in the swelling waters, and in that deluge he is overcome by fierce cold. With no support nor shelter he loses consciousness; and falling into a chasm, a white flood of water (again) rushes over his head. (Seeking) to turn his gaze upward to the light, he is overshadowed by white and yellow clouds full of water, and dully echoing as the lightning flashes. When he completely subdues these obstacles, he obtains his lordship permanently and becomes a *siddha*. Then he can put forth from himself this mastery over all that is moist, from the tip of his tongue like a great vast mass of clouds with a thousand jets of water, and when he has become a perfect *siddha*,² he can as lord (over the element) and by virtue of his *Yoga*

¹ Read: *majjate*.

² That is a *samsiddha*—a still higher state than the mere *siddha*. In Tibetan Buddhism these are called *mahāsiddhas*; the terms *yogeśvara* and *mahā-yogeśvara* (*Śuka*) have the same meaning. Like so much that is primitive, the original figures of the *siddhas* come to life again in *Tantrism* (a kind of religious magic). Certainly these forms originated from neither *Brahman* nor *Īśvara* theology, but have a quite different root; this has an important bearing on the question whether *Yoga* was originally *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* (*Yoga* associated with *Īśvara*); cf. A. Grünwedel, *Geschichte der 84 Zauberer (Mahāsiddhas)*. From the Tibetan; Leipzig, 1916.

pour out manifold (vital) juices, and impart the *dhātu*¹ to all beings, since by his *Yoga* he has attained *creative originating power*.

xi. 763. Lordship over heat. This too develops for him together with new obstacles; (at first) it creates hindrances for him, in order by their means to make him a genuine brahman.² He is beaten by "obstacles" of frightful form with sticks in their hands, in fearful guise and with hollow voices, with reddish eyes, in human shape. They tear out his eyes, they pull his tongue, they roar all together, opening their jaws wide again and again; once more they assume many other (seductive) forms, dancing before him and singing most delightfully. Then they all turn into women and fall on the disciples' necks, and in many different shapes they try, with their (tempting) arts, to obstruct them and make them lascivious. Calling them trustfully by sweet names, they all fall at their feet and bow their heads, soliciting their favours so as to hinder the progress of their *Yoga*; they chatter and gossip, they dance and play. And when he has completely subdued these obstacles, the brahman attains his lordship permanently and becomes a *siddha*.³ This dominance, in its glowing guise, is like a fiery shimmer, like the rays of the sun. Those who have attained it become like drops of water, or magnificent lights in the ether, wandering continually in the world of the sun and moon. This sublime host, celestial and radiant, enjoying the nature of sun and moon, gloriously beams and steadily holds the wheel of Time in the Universe, sustaining the different periods of Time, and the movement of the stars and planets.

xi. 776. After all this, lordship over the Earth. This too results only from the conquest of obstacles. For now

¹ The vital juice in beings.

² *Svastho* is meaningless, read *svastha-brāhmaṇa-kārane*, to produce the true (perfect) possessor of *Brahma*.

the *Yoga* disciple is seized, thrown from his *Yoga* seat, and because his desires cannot be excited he is lacerated and, trembling, hewn in pieces. Cut asunder again and again he lies in the Earth's interior, where he is suddenly bound with all kinds of things, and forcibly crushed by (beings) of many forms out of the host of evil spirits, and by yet other beings dwelling underground. Then, if he still persists in boldly aspiring to lordship over the Earth, he is smitten with different kinds of metal objects like spears and clubs, *etc.*, is cut down with swords as keen as razors, stabbed with very sharp arrow points which tear his bowels. But when he has conquered the obstacles that have thus arisen, he attains dominion over the Earth permanently and becomes a *siddha*. This mastery over the Earth manifests itself in its full glory to the victor over such obstructions when the *yogin* is about to die in *samādhi* (rapture). Then he smells celestial odours and hears heavenly things; he is separated (from his body) by beings of celestial form, and yet he is never injured; penetrating into the heart of Nature, he goes forth like the Great Spirit himself.¹

(5). It was then from these aspirations, and from these appreciations of magical and primitive *Yoga*, that *Yoga* as it appears in the Second Chapter of *The Gītā* was gradually evolved. But to compare this with the *Yoga* of Śuka gives the impression of being in a wholly different world, since there is no reference whatever to Śuka's prodigious

¹ *Pradhāna-ātmā* *va* The trend of *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* is to recognize God; and here God is a privileged individual Soul, eternally free and eternally subsisting above the bonds of *Karman* and of Nature, blessed in Himself, not creating the Universe but pervading and directing it, this idea being indicated by the expression *pradhāna-ātman*. The *yogin* does not become one with Him but henceforth, like the *spiritus principis*, permeates all beings. He attains not identity with Him, but "equality in predicates" (*sādharmyam*), an idea sharply opposed to Brahmanism; the little word *va* severs two wholly different spheres of experience; cf. pp. 180, 229.

experiences of transcendence and universality, while the transcendent state of salvation that is to be reached is discussed in purely conventional terms and without being specifically developed. Rather has the interest been completely transferred to the aspect of strenuous inner "yoking" and concentration, to "pulling oneself together" in the face of the play of sense excitations, already referred to. Here then the actual state of salvation, which must thus be striven for, has virtually become inner freedom wherewith to meet these sensuous enticements, spiritual superiority, the "independence" of the serene and self-sufficient spirit; and in this way there arises here, against the background of primitive *Yoga*, what I should like to call "Character-Yoga", for which the true *yogin* is the self-controlled man who "pulls himself together" in intense concentration, thus attaining superiority to the enjoyment of sense and the world, and at the same moment wholly uninterested in the world and its concerns.¹ He presents indeed an impressive resemblance to the Stoic, with his proud self-control and superiority to the world which is equally self-glorification—his *apatheia* and his *ataraxia*. Nevertheless the connecting links between "Character-Yoga" of this type and primitive *Yoga* still remain perfectly obvious. For the Character-*yogin*, exactly like the ancient *yogin*, is a man of strong will; his whole behaviour is a *Karma*—not intellectual activity (that is to say) but an act of will, whose predominant feature is the "firm and strenuous resolve" of the *yuktacetas*—of the man of perfectly collected, controlled or "yoked" and concentrated spirit.²

(6). Thus the essential significance of *Yoga* steadily changes, so that while the connection with primitive magic practices never completely disappears, still it falls more

¹ All this would be an adequate interpretation of *Yoga* in the sense of such "Character-Yoga".

² cf. another legend, pp. 274 ff.

and more into the background. The "harnessing" now becomes the lifelong "yoking" of the will against sense impressions and emotional agitation, a never ceasing condition of control and alertness; inner "collectedness", therefore, but at the same time persistent *exercise* of the will, together with discipline; *Yoga*, accordingly, should be rendered by "yoking" and exercise, by discipline and inner control, but especially by composure or "collectedness". Similarly, the *yogin* or *yukta* is the "self-yoker", the "striver", the man who is composed, disciplined, schooled.¹ In his relation to God, again, he is "submissive" or, still better perhaps, "devout", because with this inner composure he directs his whole being to God, so that occasionally *yogin* can be regarded as equivalent to "pious" in general: even the pious worshippers of the *devas* may be called *yogins*, though certainly not in its typical sense, while *yuktatama* or *yogavid*² would then mean "most pious" or simply "pious". But the word also assumes the general, and still not properly typical, meaning of "exercise" or "practice"; thus *Sāṅkhya-Yoga* indicates the exercise and practice of the *Sāṅkhya* intellectual methods, while *Bhakti-Yoga* is cultivation of *Bhakti* towards God. Finally, however, the significance of the term becomes so faint and generalized that the Chapter dealing with Arjuna's dejection may be entitled *Vishada-Yoga*—"Practice or Discipline in Dejection"!

(7). The experience of transcendence in primitive *Yoga*, however, can be combined with the ascent to the worlds of the gods, and also with becoming a god; while on a still higher level, it may be associated with rising to the impersonal *Brahman* or to community, or indeed even unity, with the sole highest God Himself. But at the same time *Yoga* experience, as such, could doubtless exist quite apart from both *Brahman* and *Īśvara*, that is to say as pure self-

¹ The *jitendriya* and *kṛitātman*

² "Devoted to"; "knowing what is fitting".

experience—as pure *Kaivalya-Yoga*¹; and it appears to my mind that it is the latter mode which corresponds most closely to the actual nature of *Yoga*, although on the other hand it is quite obvious that both *Brahman* doctrine and *Īśvara* doctrine could utilize *Yoga*, in which case the result would be *Sa-Brahma-* or *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*,² the latter then constituting a preliminary phase and substratum of the later *Bhakti* principles.³

(8). Finally as to the term *Karma-Yoga*. In the sense of its expansion by *Yoga* this need only mean: “practice in action”; this itself, however, would be *Karma-mārga*. I believe therefore that, as contrasted with *Sāṅkhya-Yoga*, *Karma-Yoga* is intended to stress all specific disciplinary and systematic “acts”, but more especially the active and volitional character of *Yoga* as against the theoretical attitude of the *Sāṅkhya* “way of knowledge”. In the next place, this becomes expanded into meaning that the genuine *yogin*, as a *sannyāsin* (one who practises renunciation), should not shrink from action in general but ought to practise it. Thus in spite of the indubitably close connection between *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*, both *Karma-Yoga* and *Karma-mārga* present a profound and essential contrast with *Sāṅkhya*. *Yoga* (to repeat) is no intellectual process but an act of will; and while *Yoga* can certainly appropriate *Sāṅkhya* Psychology and utilize its “differentiation” (*viveka*), still its inner attitude remains markedly different. Its relation to action, too, is unlike that of *Sāṅkhya* doctrine, since from the standpoint of the latter the exciting contest against the *Sannyāsa* (renunciation) ideal can scarcely be properly understood: What does it matter to it whether

¹ This, in fact, clearly originates from the primitive magical *siddha* ideal, which required neither *Brahman* nor *Īśvara*. *Kaivalya* is isolation from the material world, with its resultant ecstatic abstraction.

² That is *Yoga* associated with *Brahma*, or *Īśvara*, the Lord; its antithesis is *An-Īśvara-Yoga*:—*Yoga* without God. ³ cf. p. 209.

anything is effected or not? But as one who exerts his will, on the contrary, the *yogin's* attitude towards action is naturally a different one, since he has, in fact, a certain interest in it as contrasted with the world-shunning *sannyāsin*. It is certainly true that for him too action has no essentially final aim, while equally alien to him is any "metaphysic of struggle and of deed".¹ In a certain sense, nevertheless, he *requires* action—that is for self-purification (*ātma-viśuddhaye*); or in other words, as spiritual gymnastic which is directed, by means of actual accomplishment, towards the uninterrupted exercise and schooling of his superiority and freedom, since it is in this way that he continually subdues and overcomes his "attachment to the fruit of action".²

Other important aspects of *Yoga* are discussed in Chapters VI and VII.

¹ An "Indo-Aryan" Metaphysics, still further, can scarcely be derived from *Yoga*. For as the excavations in Mahenjo-daro have made it seem probable, the typical *yogin* is the original product of *pre-Aryan* India, and in that event the impressive doctrines of *The Gītā* about *Yoga* might really testify to the fruitful effects of fusion between cultures and races.

² *The Gītā*, IV 20.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORIGINAL FORM OF *THE BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ*

(i). As I have already observed, India's most sacred writ—*The Gītā*—is embedded in *The Mahābhārata*; and towards the end of this Epic another and very close parallel is to be found. An old story that is related there about Bhīshma, the revered *guru* of the two contending factions in the Epic itself, the Kauravas and the Pāndavas, was indubitably at an early period an actual part of the Epic, while its original content can still be conjectured to be the conciliatory termination of the fearful struggle, which was effected by the Pāndavas honouring the most venerable figure on their opponents' side, while on the other hand Bhīshma acknowledges the justice of the Pāndavas' claims and reveres the divine form of Krishna, who is their supporter. To this there were presumably added parting words of advice to the new king, accompanied by wise precepts and admonitions as to proper regal demeanour.

In the next stage, as we have also seen, this Literature became the home of those Treatises, streaming in in ever greater numbers, for which it was desired to obtain the sage's authority, and which constitute the current loosely connected *Moksha-dharma* as an independent book.

No one, I believe, can doubt that these actually are interpolations that have gradually been added from time to time and which, still further, exhibit many mutual discordances as well as (in my opinion) occasional traces of attempts to correct, outdo or render innocuous earlier declarations, advanced from another viewpoint opposed to the writer's own dogmas.

These Treatises are usually introduced by questions submitted by the hearer, occasional apostrophes to him by name or by some honourable designation being also interposed in order to retain the framework of a conversation; but that all this is editorial revision is perfectly obvious to everyone. The separate Treatises, again, were either written with the specific intention of including them in the *Moksha-dharma*, in which case the writer himself appended the requisite loose references to the main topic, or they were already complete and subsequently adapted, by means of similar minor insertions, to the schema of a conversation between Bhīshma and Yudhishthira. Certainly the body of doctrine incorporated in *The Gītā* is much more of a unity than is that of the *Moksha-dharma*; nevertheless the desire to perceive homogeneity throughout its entire subject-matter seems to me dangerous. For even though separate quite complete Sections are encountered here, all well constructed internally and each having a distinctive character of its own, with clear indications (still further) that we are concerned with relatively independent *separate Treatises*, in which there sometimes appear very clearly defined and characteristic doctrines of either the current or developing schools of thought, still the desire for uniformity and homogeneity must not induce us to ignore these actualities of the situation.

But, on the other hand, if underneath the entire fabric there is thrown into relief an *original nucleus*, forming a coherent whole as regards its significance and at the same moment exhibiting, not the language of doctrinal writings but rather the living speech of the Epic itself, and if (furthermore) its coherence, however seriously impaired by interpolations, nevertheless manifests itself unmistakably in the obvious interconnectedness of the different Sections, then the urgent problem presents itself of investigating this self-consistency in order to discover the actual foundational

nucleus, and subsequently, it may be, to realize how this basis became the occasion for the interpolations. And if, in addition to all this, such a “basal nucleus” proves to have been originally no doctrinal nor scholastic work of any kind, but on the contrary a *poem* which, wholly devoid of directly instructional tendencies, recounts in a style perfectly adapted to its subject a strikingly impressive portion of that great tragedy which occurred on the *Kuru* field, and which takes the form, therefore, not of an instructor’s treatise but of the creation of a genuine epic poet, this is surely the best of all proofs that the “basal nucleus” has been actually discovered—and this as a part of the epic narrative itself.

(2). The principal theme of *The Gītā*, then, is constituted by Arjuna’s personal position and its attendant circumstances; and Krishna’s utterances, so far as they *correspond* to this main situation, enjoy the primary and direct claim to originality. Everything therefore that is not included in, nor related to, this material must arouse the conjecture of being a later interpolation. What then is “this main situation”?

Having decided to begin the battle, Arjuna is overcome by *vishāda*—by that profound dejection which is described in Chapter I of the poem; but it is a depression of the noblest kind, such as only a truly great story teller can invent and mould. For he sees arrayed against him men whom he himself profoundly reveres and to whom he is deeply indebted, and finds himself compelled to *slay* relatives and friends, but above all his own “masters”, protected though they are by the sacred status of teacher; he must violate most holy *laws*; and he is overwhelmed by sorrow for the *sin* which he must thus lay upon himself: from his hands the bow *Gāndīva* falls to the ground: “*I will not fight*”¹:—this is the gist of his speech.

Arjuna’s “sorrow”, therefore, together with his protest

against this battle, is the obvious pivot upon which the whole "situation" turns; this, too, gives Krishna his own task of at last inducing Arjuna himself to declare—"The perplexity has disappeared. I will fulfil Thy command".¹ Now although they are scattered throughout, and even concealed by, the main substance of *The Gītā*, there is nevertheless a clear and logically coherent series of narratives all referring to this general situation; and it seems to me that if only we keep this pivotal feature, as I have just delineated it, firmly in view, then this primary factor, as such, can be distinguished from the verbose flood of general disquisitions, exactly as we can trace out any closely connected chain of mountain peaks.

(3). Hermann Jacobi has already associated together the verses in Chapter II which express the indestructibility of the spiritual individual, and the succeeding truly human appeal to Arjuna's chivalry, as being Krishna's original reply²; and certainly, when judged by the standard of what is adequate to the situation already outlined, with perfect justice. But can we fail to see, nevertheless, that if there is anything at all in Krishna's attitude and responses which meets the demand, it is found in vv. 32-34 of Chapter XI, together with whatever necessarily pertains to the sense of these unique stanzas as their prolegomena? For, referring most explicitly to what is involved by the impending fearful slaughter, the Deity says:

32 Kāla am I, Destroyer, great and mighty,
 Appear here all men to sweep away.
 And, without thee, would none of all these warriors,
 Here in their ranks arrayed, ever remain.

33 *By Me alone* have they long since been routed,
 Be thou *nought but My tool*.

¹ XVIII. 73.

² *Ztschrift für die Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft*, Bd. 72,
 S. 325.

34 Drona and Bhishma too, and Jayadratha,
 And Karna with the others strong in battle,
By Me already slain, slay thou. Be void of fear.

‘No doubt the strenuous and human appeal to martial honour, and also the allusion to the impotence of bodily death to injure the eternal essence of all who are concerned, are expressions that fit the actual situation. Nonetheless they are obviously a mere introduction to something much higher, and at the same time to what is far more powerful in overcoming despondency and the stubborn rejection of the battle call. Now it is precisely this that finds utterance in these verses: for Krishna opens Arjuna’s eyes to the true significance of what appears to him as being wholly meaningless and antagonistic to God, and to the implications which, in his delusion, he has never recognized nor even suspected. For the truth is that this gruesome and fearful battle is not the work of man, nor does man decide what is to happen here. Rather is the contest the Deed and the Will of God Himself, certainly incomprehensible, but also not to be judged by the human mind. Much profounder and far more in keeping, therefore, with the governing conditions than the line:

Thou sorrowest for whom thou shouldst not sorrow,
 is the dictum:

Be thou nought but My tool¹.—
 the “tool”, that is to say, of the most terrible, yet at the same moment Supreme, Divine Majesty Itself.

These words, therefore, should be called the principal verse of *The Gītā*, the *carama Śloka*, since it is solely from them that Krishna’s conversation with Arjuna receives its real significance. No generalized “theology” therefore, no *Sāṅkhya* nor *Yoga* nor even *Bhakti* doctrines, has Krishna expounded to Arjuna; rather has he revealed to him the meaning of the situation in which he finds himself, and

¹ II, 11; XI. 33.

with this his own inescapable task. At the same moment the epic poet has expressed the deepest sense which the old heroic myths and the stories of that horrible fratricidal struggle presented to him:—as being quite incomprehensible to shallow human contemplation, from beginning to end a tale of terror, a picture of dread horror, for so long as ever man's deeds shall continue to be measured by his own actions and according to human standards; and an Epic only when the curtain of human reflection is torn asunder so as to reveal, behind it, *Īśvara the Mighty*.

The magnificent Theophany of Chapter XI, therefore, is most intimately associated with the original context, for it reveals the Omnipotent and Universal One: and this in both His *ghora-rūpa* and His *viśva-rūpa*—His “terrible, awful Form” and His “all Forms”—of which the former is still more momentous than the latter.¹

(4). But Chapter X, 1–8, is equally closely involved, since it is obviously the direct preparation for the great Theophany by means of *Īśvara*'s “supreme utterance”, which He utters as the preface to the vision. For after Krishna has relieved Arjuna of his primary “care” and “sorrow”, aroused as these had been by the annihilation of his opponents, and has at the same moment appealed most powerfully to his martial feelings, he raises the outstanding theme which is “higher” than all that has hitherto been said. Hence the connecting verse x. 1, which prepares simultaneously for the climax —

Now hear My supreme utterance.

For what He now has to say is yet more sublime than any assurances of immortality or mere chivalrous comments: He will speak now as the Lord, as *Īśvara*². It is true that

¹ *cf.* p. 149.

² This is indicated by the use of capitals for the pronouns, and of small initials when Krishna speaks in human form.

He must declare what *Íśvara* is; what He here says about Him, nevertheless, is no generalized teaching about God, but likewise quite evidently takes its place in strict relevance to the specific situation; while if this latter feature is ignored the brevity of this “supreme utterance” must unfailingly excite surprise, since other passages referring to God are much more detailed. Equally must our wonder be aroused by the deeds here attributed to *Íśvara*, since they seem at first sight to be remarkably paltry: in *vv. 4-5*, for example, the assurance that all types of mental states spring from God, and in *v. 6* the scanty information that the wise men and the *Manus* of old days originated from Him. His “supreme utterance”, however, is expressly to be found in the cardinal principle:—

*mattah sarvam pravartate:
From Me everything arises.*¹

Here all depends on this, and on this *alone*. For Arjuna contemplates man’s actions and also his own deeds; consequently he is “troubled” in spirit both as to the guilt involved in his circumstances and his own guilt, while in his profound concern he regards himself as being the origin of his own action or inaction, and also as the one who, under these conditions, has to decide whether to fight or not. But, declares God to him:—“*From Me* everything arises. It is not thou who givest *buddhi* to thyself—the ability to judge and to will rightly, knowledge, clear thinking and, in one word, all spiritual conditions such as these. All these come from Me. Thou ‘sorrowest’ for the great sages and the kings, who are arrayed against thee. But *from Me* have proceeded the primeval *rishis* and the *Manus*—the primitive wise men and the ancient kings—from whom these sages and kings also, here on the battlefield, are descended. Not thine are they, but Mine; and not thine

¹ x, 8.

is the sorrow over them, but Mine. Thus (v. 8) thinks he who thinks rightly and is devoted to God."

This then is the most obvious explanation why God says apparently so little here about the Divine Nature, and why He selects such seemingly incidental examples of the Divine Power. For He says precisely what is adapted to Arjuna's circumstances, neither more nor less; while at the same time His utterance preludes what He intends immediately and visibly to reveal of Himself in a mighty vision; and in His word: "From Me everything arises", it is already implied that from Him too proceed the fearful events about to take place, as well as the reproof:—"Be thou nought but My tool".

(5). I believe, still further, that this Section, x. 1-8, which plainly meets the demands of the situation, was (as I shall show later) directly connected in the original *Text* with ii. 37, being immediately followed by Arjuna's request in xi. 1 *ff.* Both of these passages are closely linked with Arjuna's own words in xi. 1-3:—"Thou hast proclaimed the supreme secret of the true *Self*. Through this Thy Word my bewilderment is gone. As it is appointed to beings to exist and to pass away, Thou hast taught me. And likewise hast Thou taught me Thy imperishable Majesty." Thus far, then, Arjuna has heard three declarations; and these are precisely the portions of the *Text* which I myself regard as original, while Arjuna's summary of their content is in fact a critical canon for what has already appeared in the original *Text*, and what (on the other hand) cannot have been included therein. For at this point Arjuna acknowledges having learnt three truths from Krishna: "the secret of the true *Self* (*Adyātman*)", "existence and passing away", and finally "Thy imperishable Majesty"; three principles that correspond as closely as possible to the contents of those Sections which I have already selected as original. In order to remove Arjuna's *soka*—his sorrow and care—

for the opponents who are to be slain by him, Krishna has in fact imparted to him (first)—to ii. 37—the great primal secret of the indestructibility of the “true Self” (*Adhyātman*). This “true Self” is not what naïve intelligence takes it to be—not mere “life-force” (*asu*) nor the visible body, but rather the *dehin* which must be distinguished from the *deha*, the bearer of the body, and which as such is not affected by the fortunes of the body and its mere “life-force”, and which does not die when the latter perishes.¹ In the second place, Krishna at once proceeds to instruct him about the nature of “existing and passing away”; “passing away” pertains to the bodies which come and “go”, and to their *asu*, while true Being, which is at the same moment indestructible Being, exists for the spiritual bearer of the body himself. Thirdly, in x. 1–8, Krishna has proclaimed this “supreme utterance”:—that concerning the great God and His Majesty as being that of *Īśvara*, “from Whom everything arises”. These three truths, and nothing further, has Krishna proclaimed; and these three, again, and nothing further, are here accepted by Arjuna. But he does *not* admit having received from Krishna either *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga* or *Bhakti*-doctrines, nor any others, and any such interpolations as were added are at once condemned as being later insertions by this wholly schematic recapitulation in Arjuna’s speech.

(6). In support of Krishna’s words concerning His own Divine and “imperishable Majesty” (*Māhātmyam*) there now

¹ In Krishna’s utterance the term *dehn* is no doubt quite naïvely understood as a *plural*, and in that respect the commentator Rāmānuja is quite correct. For Arjuna laments that he must destroy this individual Bhīshma, this Drōṇa, these kings and relations, so that any reference to the truth that the Universal World-*ātman* is not mortal could have comforted him but little. And Krishna says (ii. 12):—“Never at any time was *I* not, nor *thou*, nor these *lords of men*. Nor shall *any of us* ever cease to be hereafter.”

follows, skilfully introduced by the desire expressed by Arjuna, the magnificent description of the Theophany in Chapter XI; and its aim, once again, is not generalized theological instruction, but solely the awakening in Arjuna's mind of the intuitive recognition of the Omnipotent Majesty depicted in x. 1-8, which intends to realize its divine goal, incomprehensible to man though it is, here on this field of death, and together with this the knowledge that Arjuna himself is nothing but the instrument in the hand of Divine Majesty. The immediate implication that must be perceived is that Arjuna has been seriously self-deceived, has indeed been guilty even of presumption, in believing that *he* must act according to his own absolute authority. In yielding to his dejection (*vishāda*) he has, though certainly quite unconsciously, been guilty of *ahamkāra*, of egotism and conceit, has been presumptuous, has forgotten, or not been aware, that he intended to encroach on the majestic prerogative of God Himself. Thus the absolutely necessary reverse of the glorious and sublime divine manifestation, and especially of the words "Be thou nought but My tool", is (on the one hand) the summons to direct his thoughts towards God instead of following his own reflections, to be mindful of God, to be *maccittas*, followed by the promise that he will in this way overcome all the "difficulties" of his soul which he has encountered owing to his sorrow and his *vishāda*; and again (on the other hand) the replacing of Arjuna within his own proper sphere, the disclosure of his creaturely *superbia* in the face of numinous Omnipotence, the revelation of the "presumption" involved in his refusal to do battle, unconscious though all this has been. Both of these principles are expressed with perfect clarity in xviii. 58 *ff.*, which must be connected with v. 61, and attain their obvious conclusion in *vv.* 72-73. This entire Section, still further, must be read in direct association with xi. 51:—"Therefore direct thy thoughts to Me; then through

My Grace thou shalt surmount all difficulties".¹ Now these "difficulties" are not the misery of *samsāra*, nor any evil in its theological sense; those actually referred to are indicated quite clearly in Arjuna's reply:—"The *perplexity* has disappeared. By Thy Grace I have gained prudence. I stand steadfast, freed from *doubt*. I will fulfil Thy command."² His "difficulties", that is to say, were *moha*, *Īśvara-smṛiti-nāśa*, *samdeha*:—delusion, corruption of the teaching of the Lord, doubt and disobedience.—*sarvadur-gāni*; the term *durga* meaning an arduous and narrow pass through a forest, or over a stream or mountain, and more especially a defile³ or "blind alley" into which one has stumbled. This is precisely what has happened to Arjuna; he will escape from it all, nevertheless, if he no longer thinks about what is not his own concern, if rather he is mindful of God Who has just manifested Himself to him as Lord and as the cause of what is happening, and Whose activity he has perceived. "But if," God continues, "from arrogance, thou wilt not obey, thou shalt perish."⁴ We must certainly assume that, owing to interpolation and editing, transitional matter may have been eliminated at this stage; nevertheless the context and the logical connection still remain perfectly clear. Regarded from a higher point of view, it was due to *ahamkāra*—presumption—or (as Garbe translated this) "pride", that Arjuna, wishing to follow his own choice and opinion, declared:—"I will not fight".⁵ This was *ahamkāra*, "I say", defiance of God, as against Whom there can be no arbitrary "I say": defiance by the creature, who fondly believes that in the face of the Universal and Omnipotent he can either be, or will or do, something entirely of his own power."

And it is at the same time *impotent* defiance since, as Krishna proceeds in 59–60:—"However defiant thou mayest

¹ xviii. 58.

² 73.

³ Apte's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*.

⁴ xviii. 58.

⁵ II. 9.

be now, still despite all thy present reluctance thou wilt be driven to fight by thine own martial nature, bound by the Power of *Karman*—that is by the compulsive Power of Destiny, which is born from thine own nature". But what is at first designated as inborn nature, and its resultant fateful compulsion, is immediately set in its proper light (*v.* 61); it is nothing else than the irresistible Power of God Who alone effects all and Who, dwelling in man's heart, with invisible cords guides and constrains the creature by His *Māyā*—His Divine Power—just as the showman does with his puppets on the stage. These words are evidently the reverse of the preceding passage—*mattah sarvam pravartate*—“From Me everything arises”, and “Be thou nought but My tool”.

The following verses however, 62–65, are obvious interpolations of later specifically *Bhakti* doctrine with which, in that form, the original material was in no way concerned, while *v.* 65, still further, is a literal citation from IX. 34. *Vv.* 66 and 72–73, on the other hand, undoubtedly revert most closely to the context of the general schema. For with *v.* 66 Krishna returns to the starting-point of the whole discussion, and it is with this in mind that this verse must be understood, since its meaning is in strict accordance with the situation. In this connection, in fact, Krishna has no occasion whatever to instruct Arjuna not to be perturbed about the various *dharma*s (duties) in the ritual sense, which may imply Vedic “religious usages”; rather must he take into consideration Arjuna's *śoka* which has been tormenting him, and from which the entire dialogue arose. Arjuna had been troubled in mind not about “religious usages”, but because he is about to violate the sacred law of reverence for his masters and throw into confusion the *dharma*s of family, kindred and nobility, thereby burdening himself with grievous sin. What Krishna means, again, by the *dharma*s is not “religious usages” in general, but

just these holy *dharma*s about which Arjuna has been “sorrowing”. Nor is it any *śoka* in general that Krishna here wishes to allay; rather do His words, “grieve not”, refer to this wholly concrete *śoka* arising from the actual situation. His injunction in *v.* 66, therefore, is simply:—“Abandon thy care and sorrow for the *dharma*s about which thou hast grieved by leaving them to Me, from Whom all *dharma*s spring. Mine is the care for them, not thine. Cease also to grieve over the sin of having presumably violated these *dharma*s. If, in the true knowledge that in all this thou art nought but My tool, thou takest refuge in Me, bowing to My Will, then will I release thee from all sin.” Solely from this standpoint can these words receive their completely concrete significance, and for this we certainly cannot substitute the wholly different sense that the devotee of *Bhakti* religion need not concern himself with the ritual *dharma*s of Vedic religion. And thus Krishna, returning specifically to the painful problems originally involved in Arjuna’s state of mind, asks the final question which is most closely associated with *v.* 66:—“Hast thou heard this, with attentive mind? Has thy perplexity disappeared?” and Arjuna replies:—“I will fulfil Thy command”.¹ All these Sections, therefore, are intimately connected with one another, so that in their original form they cannot possibly have been interrupted by *vv.* 67–71, which were the product of completely different motives and are, moreover, obviously different in their style.

The Original Gītā, then, ended quite simply as follows:—After the Deity, returning from His awful Form (*ghorarūpa*), has resumed His human guise, while Arjuna asserts that he too has now recovered from his state of ecstatic terror and is once again himself and in his normal senses, God draws the plain conclusion from the great revelation:—

XVIII. 58: Therefore direct thy thoughts to Me, then

¹ XVIII. 72, 73.

through My Grace thou shalt surmount all difficulties—thy sorrow for those about to be slain and for thy supposed violation of many sacred laws of family and kin, thy sorrow over sinful guilt and because thou wilt go to Hell, thy dejection and doubt, thy confusion . . .

66: Fret not thyself,¹ therefore, because of all the “laws” (about whose violation thou hast grieved); rely (not on thyself) but on Me alone. I will free thee from all the sins (over which thou hast sorrowed).

(7). “Abandon thy ‘sorrow’; fight, with the knowledge that thou hast to perform not thy human duties, of thine own will and power, but My work, as My tool.” It is this great, yet simple, principle that the epic poet wished to express, and not to speculate on all kinds of theories, nor teach the *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga* nor any other systems; a consideration that induces me to proceed to examine still more closely the first portion of Krishna’s speech (in II. 11-37). This too seems to me to have been originally much simpler; and only subsequently to have been disintegrated by technicalities, which to advance as such was altogether contrary to the true sense of the situation. Oldenberg, in fact, realized that an interpolation begins at II. 39 ff. which, while lacking strictly systematic formulation, expounds a popular moral *Yoga* with definite hints of *Sāṅkhya*; and the same person who added this interpolation also inserted what precedes, and elaborated it with his later insertion already in view. A survey of the earlier Section, II. 11-30, shows that *vv.* 20, 22, 29, at once attract attention as being especially recognizable merely owing to the changed versification of the finely resounding *Upendravajra* strophes; for if these are read without being interrupted by the intervening *śloka* strophes, they clearly form a well-rounded and interconnected whole. Following on the magnificent,

¹ Petersburger *Wörterbuch* gives “to abandon to its fate” for *parityaj*; here then it means “to leave alone”—“disregard”.

yet at the same time homely, introductory *ślokas* of *vv. 11-13*, and ending in the brief summary of the *śloka* in *v. 30*, they fully meet the demands of the situation and do not really require, in order to soothe Arjuna's sorrow for those about to be slain, the intrusive and somewhat bombastically pedantic *śloka* verses *14-19, 23-28*. These *Upaniṣad* strophes express simply the great principle of the indestructibility of our personal *adhyātman*—of our spiritual being which, equally eternal with Deity, escapes the transitoriness of all material bodies. Thus they adequately fulfil Krishna's purpose of relieving Arjuna's sorrow for those about to be slain, so that anything further is quite superfluous. The accordance with old *Upaniṣad* ideas is very evident, but on the other hand specific *Sāṅkhya* doctrines do not appear at all in *these* verses, while what material of this kind has been added clearly and palpably differs in its instructive style from the impressive, yet concise, plainness of the original words. What then is the relevance here of the disquisitions in *vv. 14-19*, which have no reference whatever to Arjuna, and similarly as regards the specific *Sāṅkhya* doctrine that the *ātman*, as such, is not active? What Krishna wishes to say in Chapter XI is in fact completely different from all this:—not that the *ātman* itself does not act, but rather that God is universally active, while man is nothing but His tool. The entire situation relates to the contrast between God, Who alone effects all, and the creature as the conduit and receptacle of His activity, and not to the wholly diverse antitheses between the *Purusha* (person or self), in itself inactive, and the operative *Prakṛiti* (Nature or Matter). Thus it appears to me that, originally, *11-13* formed the thesis to the Sublime Song of the Immortal Spirit as this resounds in the firmly consolidated strophes *20, 22, 29*, summarized as these are in the simple practical application of *v. 30*, which reverts to the *śloka* and thus constitutes the direct transition to *31-37*. Here, finally,

following on the lofty flight of the *ātman* idea, and wholly in keeping with the situation, a most impressive ethic of nobility and chivalry is appealed to in order to arouse Arjuna energetically from his *vishāda*, which from this standpoint must appear as nothing but frailty.

Krishna's first words addressed to Arjuna's "sorrow", therefore, are in no sense learned theories, but homely and consolatory maxims about the imperishableness and indestructibility of those whom Arjuna believes he must and can destroy; and there succeeds a powerful appeal from one warrior to another who is about to succumb to a momentary wave of feeling and abandon the attitude best befitting a true soldier; both Sections being equally in accord with the lofty martial culture presented in *The Mahābhārata*. But this does not imply that one of the warriors expounds to the other philosophical subtleties which altogether transcend the framework of the situation. Krishna begins, then, as follows.—

II. 11: Thou utterest wise things—and yet thou sorrowest for whom thou shouldst not sorrow. Whether vitality¹ has vanished or not—for that the wise grieve not. . . .

Brief and pointed are these words, courageous and sustained by old established authority; and to them Krishna adds his appeal to Arjuna's martial honour, so as to arouse him completely from his *vishāda*, in terms equally concise and pregnant, that are wholly natural in the mouth of one who is also quite familiar with the ancient and sacred doctrine of the *ātman*. But as characterized by their appeal to those chivalrous feelings and emotions which they seek most strenuously to awaken, they would indubitably present the harshest possible contrast to the glorification of *Sāṅkhya* apathy enjoined in vv. 14-15. There can, therefore, be not the slightest dubiety as to which of these passages is

¹ That is merely the "life-force" (*asu*), which is not the actual being of the indestructible *deh*.

the more genuine and more in keeping with the demands of the situation—Krishna's appeal on the one hand, or on the other these abstract scholastic terms and maxims.

(8). I believe, therefore, that the following Sections (forming Chapter I) should be read in succession and in close connection:—

Chapters I-II. 13, 20, 22, 29-37; X. 1-8; XI. 1-6, 8-12, 14, 17, 19-36, 41-51; XVIII. 58-61, 66, 72-73. At the same time it should be borne in mind that later editorial changes may well have occurred in these very passages too, so that owing either to disintegration, or to the connection of interpolations with what preceded or followed, some verses may have been eliminated or, on the other hand, have been assimilated. On the whole, nevertheless, there can be recognized in this torso one unitary train of thought, style and spirit; but above all there will appear certain features perfectly adapted to the concrete situation, which at the same time differ substantially from any kind of systematic or instructive treatment, and bear the hallmark of lofty epic *poetry*. Its intrinsic purpose, to repeat, is not to expound dogma, but rather to impress the mind most powerfully with the stupendous destiny of Man against the background of Omnipotent and Omnipresent Deity, realizing inscrutable decrees through human action; and it attains this goal in a way that has scarcely its equal in any Epic in the world.

(9). In his discussion of the depiction of the Theophany in Chapter XI, Garbe placed in brackets verse 7, then 13, 15-16, 18-19, and finally 37-40. This very probably accorded with his conviction that *The Original Gītā* was a sort of manual of *Bhakti* religion which had been to some extent corrected by Vedantic *Advaita* influences. But in this respect the following considerations should be borne in mind. It is undeniable that the vision which Arjuna beholds is intended primarily to describe not the *viśvarūpa*

form of God—not His “all-forms”—but His *ghorarūpa* as that of the Awful and Majestic Being.¹ Arjuna sees God, then, endowed with the ancient mythical features of the Majestic and the Terrible, many-headed, many-bodied,² fiercely glowing. He perceives Him as the Being Who brings about the fearful event which is even now about to occur on the battlefield, in a guise that is clearly repeated in the representations of the frightful *Mahakāla*: thus, in fact, God describes Himself:—

Kāla am I, Destroyer, great and mighty,
Appearing here all men to sweep away.³

The primary purpose here, therefore, is not to reveal a vision of the Cosmic and Universal Form, but to convey, in the most awe-inspiring way, the impression of One Who, according to His own decree, when His time is fulfilled—when, “great and mighty”, He carries out His deed of wrath—directs His judgment upon the people and, in the form of Kāla, destroys them. His own Figure is quite *distinct* equally from the spectator and from the divine beings who, while approaching Him in adoration from all sides, still do not form parts of Him. Those who are to be slain, again, are absorbed in Him, but exactly like moths in a consuming fire: here once more the meaning is not that they pertain to His Universal Form, but rather that He destroys and devours them. We must also agree with Garbe that the words in 37-40 are in marked contrast, in

¹ cf. p. 137.

² Originally this does *not* mean that God contains the Universe within Himself, but has totally different motives. I may refer to my *Gottheit und Gottheiten der alten Arier*, p. 35. Many heads, arms and bodies are expressions of the numinously terrible, not speculative symbols of Universal Unity. In the same sense must the Vedic hymn, *Purusha-sūkta* (v. 1), be understood, so far as its primary meaning is concerned, cf. *Vedic Hymns* (E. J. Thomas).

³ XI. 32.

both terminology and style, with the homely, yet noble and straightforward, confession of *v.* 43. But the most important point is that they disintegrate the evident *structure* of the whole Section and distort what seems to me to be its intended effect. For if *vv.* 37-40 are omitted (together with the words in *v.* 18, which themselves are merely a wholly superfluous anticipation of 37 *ff.*) then the avowal of *v.* 43 proves to be the dominant *culmination* to which the entire Theophany is plainly intended to *lead*; nor can there be any doubt that this was its original purpose. For not before *v.* 43, and quite justifiably so, does this confession gain its rightful position as the final consummation which *crowns* the whole structure. And thus the Deity attains His consistent aim:—Arjuna's recognition and acknowledgement of Him as what He has represented Himself to be in His introductory “supreme utterance” in *x.* 1, as truly the Mighty and Sole *Īśvara*. This extremely impressive final effect, in fact, is most grievously impaired by the anticipatory interpolations which, moreover, in marked contrast with *vv.* 43-44, are simply current *clichés* which might be associated at will with every great god, and with which, indeed, in the long run even a *Garuda*¹ might be adored. And finally: in *v.* 5 God promises that Arjuna shall see His manifold *rūpas*—the different supernatural beings of various kinds which are not so much parts of God as veritable *rūpas* or, in other terms, forms assumed by God Himself; and this too, primarily, means something altogether different from Arjuna perceiving the *Universe* as contained in God. For these reasons taken together, therefore, it is to my mind probable that the verses bracketed by Garbe are actually intrusions.²

But on the other hand, it would unquestionably be incorrect to suppose that the idea of a Personal Universal

¹ *x.* 30.

² In his own *Text*, however, Otto excludes only *v.* 18, not 19.

God, and more specifically of Vishnu-Nārāyaṇa-Vāsudeva, Who is One with the whole World and includes this within Himself, first of all originated under the influence of the *Advaita* doctrine of Non-duality; it may be, indeed, much older than all *Advaita* and all *Vedānta*. If my own derivation of the Vishnu idea is correct,¹ such a conception arose very early from the fundamental notion of a Vishnu-Vāsudeva itself. In the *Svetāśvatara Upanishad* this is attached to Hara, that is to Śiva, and in this context it does not abrogate the wholly personal and exalted status of this god. The idea of a personal World-God, still further, containing within Himself simultaneously every other god and also all other existents, subsists in just the same form in regions beyond India itself—in Tangaroa (Polynesia) for example; while even Garbe must allow the *viśvamūrti*—the “Figure universal”—to remain in *v. 46*. Not from the impersonal *Brahman*, therefore, does God derive His Universal Form; on the contrary, it may in all seriousness be asked whether the idea of a Being in the Form of the Universe is in complete accordance with the *original notion* of *Brahman* as magic *Power*, as well as with the style in which its *original predicates* were expressed, or whether ideas of this type were not transferred to *Brahman* from originally *theistic* notions of a *viśvarūpin*. Later on I shall discuss the suggestion that the occasional use of the terms *Brahman* and *Brahma-bhava* is by no means always an attempt at Vedantic correction, but on the contrary an appropriation of the word *Brahman*, and an arrangement of ideas about *Brahman*, from the theistic point of view which may imply, at the same time, an explicit *subordination* of *Brahman* to *Īśvara*.

If, in the next place, we seek an explanatory analogy to the Theophany in Chapter XI of *The Gītā*, we can scarcely

¹ *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, October 1934.

overlook that advanced by the epic poet himself very shortly before *The Gītā* in *The Mahābhārata*, vi. 131.¹ This Section depicts Krishna, unaccompanied and in a final attempt at negotiation, as having visited the enemies' camp, where Duryodhana entertains the hostile design of capturing him. But Krishna scornfully addresses him—“Thou deemest that I am here alone, and thy design is to overcome me and make me thy prisoner. But here with me are all the *Pāndavas*, and likewise the *Andhakas* and the *Vrishnis*. And here with me too are the *ādityas* and the *rudras*, the *vasus* together with the great *rishis*.” He spake, and loud laughed Keśava. But out from him, as he laughed, sprang forth in pairs, and plainly to be seen, all (these) deities. As big as one's thumb, there were the thirty gods, radiant with flame. On his back was *Brahmā*, and on his breast Rudra. The four World guardians were on his (four) arms, Agni came forth from his mouth. And the *ādityas*, the *sādhyas*, the *vasus*, as also the two *āśvins*, the *maruts* together with Indra, likewise the *viśvedevas*, the *yakshas*, the *gandharvas* and the snake-spirits. Out of his arms came Sankarshana (Krishna's brother), Dhanañjaya (Arjuna) and Bhīma, Yudhishthira and the son of Mādrī. Then all sorts of weapons from Krishna's many arms, and out of his eyes, nose and ears came forth great and terrible ones, with smoke and fiery heat, and from his pores the sun's rays.

(§). Thousand-footed, hundred-armed and thousand-eyed was the majestic one. The region of the *nāgas*² (the Underworld) was to be seen on his ankles, the sun and moon stood in his eyes, the planets were around him on all sides. The Upper Worlds were in his belly, streams and oceans were his sweat, his bones the mountains, the trees his hair. The opening and closing of his eyes were day and night. . . .

The interesting feature of this passage is that in the old

¹ The Bombay Edition, 1907.

² Serpents with human heads.

Edition of *The Mahābhārata*,¹ and also in Roy's translation, the second Half (from the sign § onwards) is omitted, which suggests that this second Part is a later addition, so that we discover here a definite tendency on the part of the interpolators, which becomes equally clearly noticeable in the passages already referred to as bracketed by Garbe.

The first Part, then, makes no mention whatever of any *viśvarūpa*, but describes the *Māyā* of an all-powerful *Māyin*, and exhibits him in his *ghorarūpa*; and only subsequently is there any attempt to derive from this the *viśvarūpa* of the Universal God. The deities, again, which the *Māyin* magically produces are not properly parts of him, but rather his *rūpas* which he at that moment blows forth from himself; and in this manner colossal miraculous power and awful superior force are primarily implied. All this illuminates the Theophany in *The Gītā* XI, and constitutes a criterion for eliminating some of its interpolations. This, nonetheless, does not involve discarding a *viśvamūrtin* or "Figure universal" as subsisting behind the great *Māyin* of this Chapter.

✓ The quotation from *The Mahābhārata* (vi. 131), again, is instructive with regard to the epic poet's own treatment of the incidents. For the mighty *Māyā* also, which he brings on the scene in this passage, relates solely and completely to *the situation*, it is to this, and not to theological doctrines, that it is intended to contribute; and this shows, still further, that the epic expedient of the Theophany is ready to his hand, so that he can utilize this whenever the occasion arises, and this removes all suspicion as regards the originality of Chapter XI of *The Gītā*. Finally, despite the close similarity between these two passages, each nevertheless is quite specifically constructed and introduced with a direct view to the relevant situation:—in the one the mighty Being Who turns into ridicule the miscreant's design, and

¹ Calcutta, 1836.

in the other the powerful One Who breaks down the *aham-kāra*—the egotistic presumption—of the creature by manifesting Himself as the sole and actual Actor in the horrors of battle, and at the same time revealing to the reluctant spectator his own limitations in being simply an instrument and nothing more.

(10). The epic poet has an exact knowledge of the current classification of the Vedic gods, which had long since acquired its own systematic terminology, as well as of their names; so that he is certainly no longer, like the *gopas* in *The Harivamśa*, outside the Vedic atmosphere. He is familiar, too, with the idea of the *Adhyātman* (the true Self) and with the ancient words of wisdom relating to this, being in this respect dependent on traditions which as such, undeniably, need by no means have become wholly incorporated within *The Upanishads*, but which are clearly developed and contained in these. The *Īśvara* of *The Gītā XI*, nevertheless, is not derived from Brahmanic-Vedic tradition; in this respect Garbe was quite correct. Still further, since our epic poet was a votary of Krishna he must likewise have been a *bhāgavata* and in close connection with the *Bhāgavata* tradition. His *Īśvara*, nonetheless, is not for this reason simply the God “of” *Bhakti* religion, and he had no intention of writing a dogmatic treatise on technical *Bhakti*:—a feature which Garbe failed to perceive. For wheresoever it arose, the consciousness of God which reveals itself here demands in the first place to be apprehended in itself and in its own specific character, freed from all sectarian interpolations. For *Bhakti* theology, like the rival *Moksha* doctrines, has as its proper object the theme of *supermundane redemption*. This, however, never arises in the plot of the Epic itself, nor again in the dialogue between Krishna and Arjuna. What these are actually concerned with is absolute subjection to the Almighty Will of God, Who is exalted far above all mankind and all human

interests; this is undoubtedly quite incomprehensible, but for that very reason it is all the more binding. Traces of this God must not be sought in the ancient *Brahman*, with which He has not the faintest shadow of an attribute in common; nor, again, in the Universal World-*ātman*. He may be able to subject both of these to Himself, and even to assimilate them, but this only in such a way as to subordinate them to Himself. This God, therefore, in whatsoever manner He was preluded, originated purely and wholly from that numinous awareness of Majesty which I have discussed in *The Idea of the Holy*.¹ He is, therefore, the God of absolute predestination, as indeed *vv. xi. 32-33* exhibit Him; for here God demonstrates that, independently of and before all human will and action, the future has long ago been unalterably determined by Him, that all human will is utterly powerless against Him and His sole activity, and that man is nothing but the conduit for His operations, against which the *superbia* of *ahamkāra* struggles—and struggles *impotently*, as *xviii. 60, 61*, proceed to show. We find additional traces of this Almighty Being, Who is the sole Actor, in the impressive dialogue between Draupadī and Yudhishthira in *The Mahābhārata, Vanaparvan* *30*.² Draupadī's knowledge about this Omnipotent God is derived from obscure and *ancient* report, and He is also described in almost exactly the same terms in *The Original Gītā*, *xviii. 61*. Her feelings rebel against Him, and she advances the arguments commonly opposed to the numinous idea of the predestinating and solely acting God. Her words, nonetheless, give an unmistakable impression of how deeply this mighty intuition of God, obtainable from no phase whatever of Nature mythology, must at one time have existed in certain spheres of Indian life.

¹ Pp. 14 ff., 20 ff.

² cf. *India's Religion of Grace and Christianity Compared and Contrasted*, pp. 111 ff.

If we search for a parallel to this *Īśvara*, we find it most indubitably in the intense intuition of God in *Job*. Here is exactly the same God, in the face of Whose inscrutability all creatures are silent and dumb, and yet find at the same time inner *śānti*, peace, in the experience of the Transcendently Powerful. We discover Him, again, in St. Paul's question:—"Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, Why hast Thou made me thus?"; and these parallels plainly warn us against deriving such religious intuitions from any sectarian sources whatever, and still more from "blood and soil"; for *Job* was an Edomite—a Semite---while St. Paul was a Jew. They place us on our guard equally against perceiving the exalted feeling of equality and relationship with "Ultimate Reality" as the peculiar attitude of Aryan-Indian religion, in contrast with the "absolute feeling of dependence" of certain perverse Jewish souls. In *The Gitā*, XI, *Īśvara* is no "Ultimate Reality" to which precedent realities should lead, but rather the "Wholly Other" which is alien and absolutely superior to all "Reality", standing over against it in absolute antithesis. And the emotion aroused by Him is certainly not the pride of existential affinity, but on the contrary the vanishing into nothingness in the face of that which alone exists and acts. "My tool and nothing more."

If, however, we insist on looking for historical origins of this concept of God, then to me only one seems possible; and this not the specific Vishnu idea, but that of the austere and magnificent, yet terrible Rudra; as to which a word or two more. For since our epic poet is a Krishna worshipper, while the Krishna cult was undeniably replete with *Bhakti*, which means with powerfully emotional love aspects, we must assume that already, and before his own day, contact and reciprocal permeation had subsisted between the *Vāsudeva-Vishnu* cult on the one hand, and the active influences of Rudra religion on the other. Connections

between Arjuna and Rudra, in fact, appear in many forms, and clearly and emphatically, in *The Mahābhārata*, so that the question may well be pressed whether, once the legendary material of *The Mahābhārata* had transcended those primitive stages of Vedic polytheism of which it still bears so many traces, the Epic was not in the main markedly affected by the Rudra idea. The striking expression in Arjuna's confession in xi. 43:—

Thou art most venerèd, the world's reverèd *Guru*,

points very definitely in this direction, since in its specific sense *Guru* is not Vāsudeva, but precisely Rudra-Śiva,¹ while in *Vanaparvan* 30–31 the obscure god of predestination is called Īśāna; this, however, is one of the ancient characteristic names of Rudra-Śiva.

(ii). That later interpolations were added, and this in such a way that entire Treatises, and gradually collections of these, were inserted, in which very similar subject matter was sometimes expounded and repeated, but on other occasions contents markedly different and self-contradictory, intended to outdo, correct or even exclude what had previously been included, is placed beyond any possible doubt by the *Moksha-dharma*. In the so-called *Anugītā* in fact (as was observed in beginning this Chapter), an attempt has even been made to supplement, if not actually to replace, the entire completed *Gītā* by a later new work. But the immeasurably profound and powerful content of *The Original Gītā* must have challenged any such treatment; and this was accompanied by the desire to secure, for certain special doctrines, the protection of this great Divine Form, while the association of related, or supposedly related, ideas also operated, together with the wish to fit these noble divine thoughts into one's own ways of thinking.

¹ It is remarkable, too, that Krishna's brother is called Sankarshana; this is a typical Rudra name.

Finally, there was the active impulse to insert corrections wherever these ideas too painfully disintegrated the framework of any given intellectual attitude; and thus various interpolations arose from Glosses following distinct tendencies, and this not merely in single instances, since complete systematic and coherent doctrinal Treatises (as for example in the *Moksha-dharma*) were written specifically for insertion and then added on. But the analytical investigation of all these separate Treatises, the isolation of their individual characteristics, and the substantiation of specific interpolations, have been undertaken in the next Chapter.

(12). Any final substantiation of the distinctions that I have suggested would necessitate a rendering and elucidation of the entire *Gītā*. Here, however, I shall add only a few explanatory comments on the important Section of *The Original Gītā*, x. 1-8.

If all the theological disquisitions of the preceding Sections had actually been completed this brief, concise and conclusive passage would be wholly superfluous. For after all the "highest" and "supreme" utterances which anticipate it, this dictum would not be genuinely "supreme", but a virtual triviality. Particularly pointless would be v. 2, in which Krishna imparts to Arjuna the mystery of His own Person; for this He would have done long ago, and in much more detail, in Chapter IV. Actually, however, the present Section immediately follows the introductory Speech in II. 11-37. There warrior has spoken to warrior, appealing to ancient words of wisdom and of martial honour; and now he wishes to utter what is still higher, nay, the very highest of all. He speaks, therefore, no longer as warrior, but in virtue of the secret of His personal Godhead He reveals Himself in His superhuman dignity, and teaches Arjuna to recognize in Him the God "from Whom everything arises", and to Whom "he who has insight" must submit himself in humble adoration:—

1. Now hear further My supreme utterance; because thou art dear to Me, I will proclaim it to thee for thy good.

Thus He first of all makes known to Arjuna the mystery of His own Person:

2. Neither the hosts of *devas* nor the great *rishis* know My source.

Neither gods nor sages know and understand the origin of Him Who is this very Krishna, and therewith His true Being,

For altogether more ancient than they am I.

In other words: I am in truth the Eternal God Himself:

3. He who knows Me as the unborn, the beginningless, the great LORD of the world:

in his own terse and characteristically pithy style, with not one superfluous nor missing word, the epic poet proclaims the highest secret of all:

He among mortals, free from delusion, is released from all sins.

Once again these words refer quite concretely to Arjuna's actual situation: he has been perplexed and troubled about sin. But both spiritual confusion and sin flee from him who knows the Ruler of all and submits to His service.

4. From Me alone arise of beings the manifold states of mind: power of decision, judgment, knowledge, purity of spirit, capacity to endure, true insight, discipline, serenity,

5. compassion, equanimity, contentment, self-control, doing good, glory and infamy.

Arjuna had believed that the decision could and should be his own; he had supposed that he must let himself be guided by what he presumed were his own emotions, by compassion, by due regard for what was becoming and unbecoming, honourable and dishonourable. He never

¹ So Rāmānuja.

realized that these are all simply the cords wherewith God Himself directs His creatures.

6. Likewise the primeval beings, the seven great *rishis* and the four *Manus*, arose only from Me, generated by My Spirit; and from them descend these creatures in the world.

Arjuna has been troubled in spirit about the sages, the kings and the people arrayed before him, to be slain by him. But they too spring from God alone, and God only, not Arjuna, can decide their fate.

7. He who knows in truth this manifestation of My Might and My creative Power—that is, he who recognizes in the play of inner motives, as in the existence of created things, the manifested Power of Him Who alone effects all—is armed with unshakable constancy.

Avikampena yogena:—with just that concentrated and steadfast inner tension of will and self-control which Arjuna, in his *vishāda*, lacked entirely.

And now there follows the brief summary of this superbly constructed Section:

8. I AM THE SOURCE OF ALL, FROM ME EVERYTHING ARISES.

Whoso has insight knows this. And with this insight he worships Me, impressed by awe.

The prudent and pious man, submitting himself humbly to the Omnipotent One, is here held up to Arjuna, and contrasted with his own confusion and *ahamkāra*, so that he too may gain insight and humility.

Thus after first of all, and by way of introduction, declaring the mystery of the “true Self” (*Adhyātman*), and together with this of true Being and decay, Krishna has now (in the third place) proclaimed the secret of his own Person, and at the same time the “imperishable Majesty” (*Māhātmyam*) of God manifested in Him as that of the One Who alone effects all things. Arjuna at once acknowledges all these three truths in xi. 1-3, and consequently his perplexity is

already vanishing with its opening words; and in order therefore to destroy his *ahamkāra* completely, the Exalted One now adds to His “supreme utterance” the stupendous *vision* of ĪŚVARA, thus finally substantiating the “utterance” and transforming it into the most intimate of all personal experiences.

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINAL TREATISES OF THE SECOND PART OF *THE BHAGAVAD- GĪTĀ*: I-IV

IN Chapter I, I have disengaged the ancient Epic from its later superstructures, of these, four pertain to the Second Part of *The Song*, and the remainder to its First Part; their principal characteristics appear in the following Schema:

TREATISE I: *The Gītā*, XI. 52-XII. 20. This is a pure *Prapatti-Bhakti* Treatise, unaffected by any Glosses, unspeculative and unsupported by philosophical theories, following in the main the trends of the later *Nārada-Bhakti Sūtras*, but clearly demarcated as a separate and independent Treatise by the designation *Dharmya-amritam idam*¹ in its concluding verse.

TREATISE II: XIV-XV. This too is definitely characterized and thrown into relief as a specific Treatise by the contents of XIV. 1 and XV. 20. It inculcates *Sa-Sāṅkhya-Bhakti*: *Bhakti* theology utilizing the *Sāṅkhya* doctrine of the soul, and very clearly presented, although the Gloss, XV. 12-15, is quite foreign to its obviously recognizable main drift and interrupts, in a patently clumsy fashion, the otherwise neat arrangement of the well-constructed Treatise.

TREATISE III: XVI-XVIII. 57.

(A). XVI. This is a plain and unsectarian moralistic Theism, with no specific *Bhakti* character. Unskilfully and mechanically combined with this, by XVII. 1, is:—

(B). XVII. 2-XVIII. 49. Moralistic Three *gunas* doctrine;

¹ cf. p. 300.

but XVII. 23-28 and XVIII. 45, 46, are Glosses. The two interconnected Sections (A) and (B) are utilized in

(C). XVIII. 50-55, by means of systematic and strict *Bhakti* doctrine, and in vv. 56, 57, just barely adapted to the context of *The Original Gītā*, which is resumed in v. 58. The briefer interpolations, x. 9-11 and XVIII. 62-65, 67-71, are apparently from the same hand.

TREATISE IV: XIII. *Sa-Īśvara-Sāṅkhya*. It is evident that its uniformly clear structure is clumsily impaired by the Glosses 2; 4; 12-18; 27, 28; 30.

TREATISE V: V. *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* are connected together. The association which is plainly asserted by this dictum, and which is equally clearly elaborated, cannot be concealed by the obtrusive Glosses 6, 7; 10; 18-22; 24-26.

TREATISE VI: VI-IX.

(A). *Typical Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, VI. 1-46,

(B). utilized and intensified by *Bhakti* doctrine, VI. 47-IX. 34. VI. 27-32 is an *Advaita-Bhakti* Gloss; with the Gloss VII. 8-11, cf. Treatise VIII, and for the others, Chapter VI.

TREATISE VII: II. 39-IV. 42. *Untypical Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*—

Character-*Yoga* as distinguished from psycho-technical *Yoga*. The Glosses, III. 9-18; IV. 24-32, were inserted by a theologian concerned with sacrifice; they are foreign to the tenor of Character-*Yoga*, and plainly derange the easily recognizable main structure.

TREATISE VIII: X. 12-42. God as *optimum in omnibus*.

A Song of Praise, marked by its own specific conception of the divine, and referring to neither *Advaita* nor *Bhakti*, nor any other special scholastic doctrines, nor again to Arjuna's actual situation, but inserted here simply to glorify Krishna.

The purpose of the present Chapter, therefore, is to discriminate between the separate Treatises (I-IV) themselves,

and also to elucidate and appreciate their individual characteristics; V-VIII are dealt with in Chapter VI. Undoubtedly they conceal the original form of the primitive narrative; nevertheless we may be thankful that it was utilized in this way to incorporate such interesting and important products of the contrasted spiritual tendencies in ancient India, so as to preserve them for posterity.

TREATISE I: THE *Gītā*, XI. 52-XII. 20.

(1). This is evidently a self-complete Treatise, displaying very clearly the mature composition and individuality of a typical "Treatise", while as a manual of *Bhakti* theology it exhibits the specific tendency later described as *Prapatti-Bhakti*, and also elucidates the original version of the *Krishna-Arjuna-Samvāda*.¹

Having itself originated in *Bhāgavata* circles, *The Original Gītā* must naturally have invited *Bhāgavata* theologians to add supplements and specifically doctrinal productions that involved, indeed, material from *Bhakti* theology. But all this, and very probably from quite an early period, remained internally heterogeneous, so that in investigating these contents of our own *Gītā* I must repeat that it is imperative not to allow an over-hasty desire for homogeneity to induce us to ignore characteristic individual implications, tendencies and even discordances.

(2). The Specific Tendencies in *Bhakti* Theology. The term *Bhakti* means devoutly loving attachment to one's own particular God; it is in itself, therefore, a powerful emotion which may assume ecstatic form as *prema*.² It permeates the most diverse cults:—that of Vishnu-Vāsudeva, of Śiva-Rudra, of Durgā and also—first of all as simple

¹ *cf.* p. 11.

² "A fevered, glowing Krishna-eroticism, coloured throughout by love passion; and intoxication enters into the experience." *Mysticism East and West*, p. 161.

Guru-Bhakti—of Buddha; and it manifests itself in different types and degrees:—

(A). As faith, trust and love it implies a personal relation to a Personal God; and thus its occasionally rigorous rejection of the impersonal *Brahman* and of *Brahman-Advaita* can be duly appreciated, even though it *may* itself lead on to these. On the other hand, it is clear that a certain type of non-dualistic *Advaita* ideas may be in complete accordance with it—a feature overlooked by Garbe.¹ For (once again) whenever his emotions become excitedly ecstatic the devout lover forgets himself in his God; he experiences and feels unity with Him, so that it is just the highly wrought *Advaita* notions that can afford him occasional opportunities to express his own experience.² It is in fact Prahlāda, the typical representative of intense personal *Bhakti*, who above all experiences himself as united with, and indistinguishable from, *Purushottama*, the Supreme Person. Such great and outstanding *Texts* as the *Vishnu* and *Bhāgavata Purāna*s, still further, exhibit these *Advaita* states as their final culmination, so that it is quite incorrect to regard all this as merely the outcome of the *Brahman* theologians' falsification of the original purely personal *Bhakti* ideas in this way, in order to incorporate them to some extent into their own systems. Rather must we assume that it was precisely the original *Vishnu-Bhakti* that already contained the germ of all these developments within itself. They originated in the worship of the great god of the seasons,³ whose reawakening was celebrated in the woods with Dionysiac enthusiasm by song and jubilation, so that it is more than probable that this cult included, from the very beginning and as the result of

¹ cf. my Essay, *Mystische und gläubige Frommigkeit*, in *Sünde und Urschuld*, pp. 140 ff.

² cf. my *Mysticism East and West*, p. 161.

³ As I have attempted to prove in *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, October 1934; cf. further Chapter VII, pp. 258 ff.

direct experience, those ideas of being seized upon and penetrated which imply being one with the *numen*. In the *Bhakti-ratna-āvalī*, 16, for example:—"The *vrishnis*, when reclining or sitting all together, or wandering about with Krishna talking or playing, bathing or eating, lost themselves in thought about Krishna, and completely *forgot* their own *separate* existence". Here the *Advaita* state clearly originates from *Bhakti* itself; while according to the *Svetāśvatara Upanishad* a similar assumption must be made regarding the Rudra cult, even though it sprang from a different root. If then these conditions prevailed, the result was a relationship towards *Ātman-Brahman* mysticism altogether the reverse of that assumed by Garbe, so that we must recognize many of the passages which he suspected and questioned as being perfectly genuine *Bhakti* Sections, and perceive in them no Brahmanic correction of *Bhakti*, but rather a utilization of the ancient mysticism for the *Īśvara* of *Bhakti*; and for this type of *Bhakti* I shall employ the term *Advaita-Bhakti*.

(B). But on the other hand, *Bhakti* can develop with no mystical tendencies to unification of any kind whatever, and purely as a humble relationship of trust and love. Whereas the type of *Bhakti* considered in the preceding Section can develop in association with, and can utilize, *Yoga* practices and *jñāna*, that is to say psychical technique and lofty, speculative knowledge of God, together with theology, still there subsists in this *Bhakti* a tendency to disregard both these aspects, to pursue the course of a lay religion, to renounce psychical practices, not to enquire about elevated *jñāna*, and to value solely complete spiritual surrender to God and the steadfast experience of being "His". This orientation we find in the *Bhakti Sūtras* of Nārada, which set the standard for the *Bhakti* ideal; and here is no trace whatever of *Advaita*, no pursuit of speculative knowledge of God, of theology nor of *Yoga* technique,

but simply an intense emotional pietism: a development culminating in the appearance and the accentuation of *Prapatti*—of “coming near” or “approach”. Originally, no doubt, *Prapatti* was merely homely *Bhakti* as such, consisting in simple trust; but subsequently it became specifically distinguished from this, which was then disparaged as compared with its new rival, so far as this stressed more powerfully the simple and austere purity of the relationship of surrender in a plain and humble attitude of trust, perceiving genuine piety in this rather than in the spiritual intensity of *Bhakti* discipline. At a still later stage, again, *Prapatti* came intellectually into direct contrast with the original *Bhakti*; as a tendency, nonetheless, it had for long been incorporated within the latter itself, while as an inner spiritual mood it responds most readily to the stern, yet sublime and exalted, MIGHTY ONE of Chapter XI of *The Gītā*, Who must be worshipped not with melting feelings and ecstasies of soul, but with the consciousness of absolute dependence in pure surrender and humility. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that in His Self-revelation, as depicted in this Chapter, one Section of the Proclamation, conforming to type (B), has been directly inserted, portraying and demanding at even this early stage, and with markedly systematic clarity in the later scholastic terms, this very type of *Bhakti* which tends towards *Prapatti*. For this is the theme of the brief, but beautiful, well-constructed and evidently self-contained Treatise I, which I shall now discuss in fuller detail. Its Subdivisions are as follows —

Dharmyāmritam: the Doctrinal Writ of *Prapatti-Bhakti*.

Vv. 52-54: The Editorial connection with what precedes.

(I). The Theme: *v. 55*.

(II). *Pūrvapaksha*: (Preliminary statement): the Attitude towards *Brahman* doctrine: *xii. 1-5*.

(III). *Siddhānta*: (The Canon): the Way of *Bhakti*, and its four advancing stages: *6-11*.

- (iv). *Prapatti-Bhakti* as the best Way: 12.
- (v). The Ethics of the *Bhakti-sādhu*: 13-20.

In His great Epiphany, in *The Gītā*, xi, the Supreme Exalted One accorded not a single word to the exposition of any general doctrine of salvation. For as I have previously contended, He had appeared not to instruct Arjuna about everlasting bliss, but to prove Himself to be the One Who sways the fortunes of war, and so to summon Arjuna to his duty as a mere instrument. The sole necessary and direct consequence of this manifestation, therefore, was to demand from Arjuna, as mindful of this God and His Will (*mat-citta*), the abandonment of his *ahamkāra* or self-conceit, as xviii. 58 *ff.* plainly show. (The utmost that can be conceded is the *possibility* of consolatory and gracious declarations, concerned with Arjuna's salvation, *following* these admonitions.) The present Treatise, however, has a wholly different intention: it is a brief and self-contained compendium of the way of salvation of *Bhakti-mārga*, specifically of the type already described in (B), and finding its later and more definite development and consolidation in the *Nārada Sūtras* and in *Prapatti* doctrines.¹ This Treatise obviously culminates in xii. 20:—"He who sincerely follows this excellent law"—that is the *dharma* of *Prapatti-Bhakti*—"as it is here proclaimed, devoted to Me in faith, he is dearest of all to Me".²

Whoever expresses himself in these terms has reached his ultimate standpoint, beyond which there is really nothing further nor different that can be said. He has finished, like one who has completed his treatise and fulfilled his special *dharma* or duty. The introductory verses xi. 52-54, therefore, must be recognized as an editorial attempt to insert this Treatise in a fairly satisfactory way, and at the

¹ In order to distinguish it from *Advaita-Bhakti* I shall call this *Prapatti-Bhakti*; cf. *The Gītā*, xii. 12 and Note.

² cf. further p. 300.

same time to justify the interpolation; and in order to effect the requisite connection they first of all simply repeat the contents of vv. 47, 48, in the original script, at the same moment, however, modifying their sense, which refers to the uniqueness of this most extraordinary experience with which Arjuna had been favoured for a quite peculiar and specific purpose. Twice over they say expressly that such a spectacle has never been exhibited to anyone except Arjuna; v. 54, on the other hand, is clearly concerned with *sākshātkāra*—with the visual imagination of the divine Form—which as a quite everyday occurrence is imparted in all *Bhakti* devotion, being a regular constituent of the *ordo salutis* of *Bhakti* discipline. In vv. 47–49 there was no reference whatever to “coming to Me” (v. 55); this was quite out of the question, since Arjuna is not to “come to the Lord”, but to fight and to fulfil his duty as an instrument. But here the sense is skilfully changed into that of the ultimate goal of redemption.

After this editorial and interpolatory comment (xi. 52–54), there follows the Treatise itself, well and systematically constructed.

(1). We have first of all, in v. 55, the brief formula of the basal Creed and summary of *Bhakti* doctrine; this is the doctrine of salvation—of “coming to the Lord”; and as all *Bhakti* theology teaches, the “pathway” (*mārga*) to this is: (1) to accomplish *matkarmān*, which here means not (as Garbe translated it) “to act for my sake” but, in the technical *Bhakti* sense, “to carry out the regular activities of *pūjā* (worship)”. (2) *Matparama*—the directing of the spirit to God. (3) *Madbhakta*—this orientation understood as loving faith. (4) *Sangavarjita*: *Bhakti* united with the *ethos* of all Indian doctrines of salvation and equally distinctive of *Bhakti* tendencies—detachment, that is to say, from all interest in the things of the world; and at the same time *nirvaira*—“freedom from enmity towards any living

being". These terms, occurring at the outset somewhat in programme fashion, are afterwards discussed in greater detail; and it is in the light of this specifically detailed treatment, and not from more generalized viewpoints nor arbitrarily chosen associations, that they must be interpreted.

(ii). The theme having thus been stated, there next follows (in xii. 1-5) a decision upon an antagonistic stand-point introduced, in accord with a popular method, by a question from the disciple. In view of the actual situation, however, Arjuna certainly had no motive whatever to ask how *Īśvara*, in His self-manifestation, is related to the impersonal and transcendent *Aksharam*—the Eternal—or in other terms to the *Brahman-Ātman* of the *Advaita* schools. But until the time of Rāmānuja's *Bhāshya*, this latter is the polemical starting-point and the peg on which, as the preliminary statement (*pūrvapaksha*), individual and positive doctrines came to be suspended. Of course the adverse teaching has not yet become, as it is for Rāmānuja, diabolical, it is still highly regarded as a religious attitude, as one way to the Highest; only it is both tortuous and toilsome, and its outcome is not that it leads to any actual goal distinct from *Īśvara* Himself. For this path too ultimately shows the way "To Me ALONE" (*Mām eva*)—*eva* must not be ignored here. "In Me alone" is the true goal: and "to Me" there is one direct and simple road—*Bhakti-mārga* itself.

(iii). But this way too has its own difficulties; its ideal is that very *bhakta* saint who actually exhibits all the characteristics which were concisely depicted in v. 55. The genuine *bhakta* saint, then, is he in whom is found, unper-
turbed and freely self-surrendering, the spiritual condition of complete concentration upon God, never interrupted nor artificially sustained by self-exertion. Such were the great saints Nārada and Prahlāda, and also the *ālvārs* of the *Bhakti* community—those who, wholly absorbed in God,

experience *Bhakti* within, “flowing uninterruptedly like a stream of oil”. To these *vv.* 6-8 refer, admittedly in the definite sense of a saintly ideal that had already grown technical and typical; while here too the ideal of being submerged in *Brahma-Advaita* is to be outbidden by complete absorption in God.—

XII. 6: He who, casting all (previous) actions¹ upon Me, turns to Me and worships Me, while he meditates upon Me in unbroken composure, 7 such a one, whose mind is placed wholly in Me, shall I straightway² raise on high from the ocean of death and *Samsāra*. 8 Set thy mind on Me alone, place thy feelings in Me; in Me, Myself, shalt thou dwell hereafter.³

¹ Actions, including those that are good, bind to *samsāra*; they must be cast upon God, and the *original* meaning of this can scarcely be that this is a “sacrifice” to God whereby He is honoured; apparently God is here regarded primarily as *pavitram*—as a means of expiating and destroying the constraining fatality which all action in itself possesses.

² Here *na cirāt* must not be overlooked. It is a litotes meaning “immediately, without further pause or delay”; in other words, with no intervening rebirth; and here this privilege of “non-returning” in rebirth (*anāgāmin*) is obviously reserved for the genuine saints of *Bhakti-mārga*.

³ In his *Sādhū Sundar Singh* C. F. Andrews tells us that this ideal of a *Bhakti* saint reposing wholly in God still lives in India to-day “Those who become thus wholly absorbed in God are called *Bhaktas*, and when that name has once been given to them, by popular consent, they are released from many of the ordinary duties of life, even while they remain in Hindu society. Very gradually and almost imperceptibly, each part of the daily round, which does not come within the scope of their religious devotion, is given up. In certain cases the *bhakta* finally abandons all social ties whatsoever and becomes a *Sannyāsin*. In other instances, some minor duties within the home still continue, but the daily life even then becomes almost monastic in its solitary character—forming a cycle of incessant prayer and worship” (p. 55). This is the meaning of the present passage too; and in this respect this Treatise, in its own individual character and as exhibiting a special tendency, differs most definitely from others in which the *Sannyāsa* ideal is combatted. According to *v.* 16, this ideal expressly involves that “all under-

A lofty ideal, vouchsafed only to the rare few and to the elect.

He in whom this permanent spiritual condition fails to arise, as a gift of grace to certain chosen saints, must practise—continues *v. 9—Abhyāsa-Yoga*—he must pursue the toilsome path of technical discipline in absorption and concentration, so that he may thus fit himself gradually for the steadfast orientation and constant directing of the spirit to God.

But for most people even this is too difficult. He who cannot achieve it, therefore, whoever is debarred by affairs and circumstances, should at least practise *matkarmāni*; and every *Bhakti* manual shows us the wholly concrete sense of this term here and in this special connection. The ordinary layman (that is to say) is incapable of lofty *Yoga* exercises; what he can practise, nevertheless, is *pūjā* (worship) in the temple before the *arcā* (image) of the god:—he can bring flowers, leaves and fruits as offerings, burn incense and swing lamps before him, make images and build temples for him or contribute to their construction, adorn these with gateways and flags, with bathing pools, trees and shrubs; he can give alms, observe the normal code of Ethics, read Holy Scripture and cause it to be read, thus following the *Karma-mārga* which *Bhakti* too includes in its *ordo salutis*.

For many, however, this also is toilsome and too difficult. Temple building requires money, exactly as very much pertains to the methodical pursuit of this way of *Karma* which the ordinary man cannot perform. And almost unavoidably are all such *matkarmāni* constrained by the thoughts of recompense for what has been actually done. takings" be abandoned, while *v. 19* specifically inculcates homelessness—"without a home". In this markedly individual Treatise, therefore, the perfect *bhakta* is regarded throughout as being a *sannyāsin* also; but if *The Gitā* were truly a unitary work such demands as these would be quite impossible.

There is, nonetheless, one ultimate and simple way which everyone without exception can travel:—renouncing all personal striving and endeavour and resigning oneself completely and solely to God's saving and miraculous Power, at the same time abandoning all thought of reward and submitting to self-discipline. This is the simple meaning of *v.* 11, as is at once evident in the light of the principles of *Bhakti* practice:—“If thou art unable to do this”—that is to pursue the path of *Karma-mārga*—“then take thy refuge in My saving wondrous Power (*madyogam āśrita*¹), and practise hereafter in self-control the abandonment of the fruit of all action”.

This absolute dependence on Divine Power is nothing other than what was later called *Prapatti*—“approach” or “draw near”; one of the meanings of the term *āśri* itself being, in fact, “to approach, or draw near to someone”. In accordance with the pedantic methods of Hindu systematizers, however, this perfectly simple spiritual act of sheer, self-abandonment to God subsequently became analysed into its five *angas* (aspects or subdivisions):—(1) the firm resolve to be in accord with the Lord, and to surrender oneself completely to His Will: (2) the exclusion of all disagreement: (3) the conviction that “He will save me”: (4) the wish: “May He be my shepherd”: (5) humble resignation to Him.² All this is undeniably much more detailed than the simple *madyogam āśrita*, which means, however, exactly the same.

(iv). Thus far the *mārga* has been described as an ordered series of four stages, “drawing-near” then being the attitude of the wholly simple-minded man of homely devotion, a last resource as it were for those incapable of attaining the higher levels. But in the following *v.* 12 this evaluation

¹ *Madyoga* is a current expression for God's miraculous Power; cf. xi. 8, and other passages.

² cf. my *Dīpikā des Nivāsa*, p. 54.

assumes a different aspect; the posture of sheer surrender—*Bhakti*—which culminates in the “drawing near”, is now extolled as the *best* of all and styled *dhyāna* (meditation). This however by no means implies the well-known phase of *Yoga* technique, since *Yoga* itself is here rejected altogether as of *inferior value*. *Dhyāna* therefore represents at this period, exactly as it does in later *Bhakti* scripts, simple trusting *piety* as such; and in this sense of the term both *upāsanā* (reverent adoration) and *dhyāna* (and even *jñāna* itself) subsequently become expressly identified with *Bhakti-Prapatti*. Thus *v. 12*, occasionally regarded as wholly incomprehensible, is most clearly elucidated:—“For better is knowledge than *Yoga* technique (*abhyāsa*), but far more excellent than knowledge is the devout mind”. This is most clearly manifested whenever anyone, abandoning all other *upāyas* (preparatory attitudes), surrenders himself solely to God’s saving Power.

For as *v. 11* has shown, “from the devout mind there springs the abandonment of the fruit of action, and close upon this abandonment”—of all desire to have something for oneself—“follows peace of soul”.

This is pure and typical *Bhakti-Prapatti* doctrine, subordinating the lofty knowledge of God, *jñāna*, hitherto highly praised even in *Bhakti* circles themselves, to the homely piety of *dhyāna*; a spiritual attitude that knows nothing of the mystical rapture of the experience of unity, since it finds its all in the belief that the Lord, the Shepherd, saves. This is simple and plain lay pietism, its mood as remote as is possible from all non-dualistic *Advaita* mysticism.

The numinous terror of the MIGHTY ONE, nevertheless, has long ago faded away, so that it is perfectly obvious that this sketch of a religion of the “devout in the land” can neither be original nor written, in the present context, by the same hand which, in the preceding Chapter, revealed the dread mystery of the “Destroyer of all men”.

(v). In the concluding Section of his Treatise, finally, our interpolating author, here again adhering to the method of the *Bhakti* manuals, expresses in curt phrases the peculiar *ethos* which, as the attitude adopted towards the world, accompanies the spiritual orientation of this mood of self-renunciation to God, and which is at the same moment expressly the *ethos* of renunciation (*Sannyāsa*). But here, likewise, there is not one word that has any direct reference to the content of Chapter XI. On the other hand, in the concluding verse the words, "this ambrosial *dharma*, thus expounded", prove that the writer of this short but eloquent passage intended to give, in spite of its brevity, a compact and rounded-off summary of one specific "*dharma*", the best rendering of the phrase *dharmaya-amritam idam* being "this precious doctrine about faith".

Chapter XVIII. 50-57, is another instance of typical *Bhakti* theology which should be considered in connection with the self-contained Treatise XVI-XVIII. 49, to which it is somewhat artificially attached, while the brief interpolation, x. 9-11, is also presumably from the same hand. This follows x. 1-8, which I have already maintained to be part of *The Original Gītā*; and that it is an interpolation is obvious. For as I have previously argued, the author of *The Original Gītā* had no inducement whatever to impart any soteriological doctrine to Arjuna or, in view of the actual situation, to exhort him to cultivate pious intercourse and engage in edifying discourse with other *bhaktas*. On the other hand, it is indubitable that these features, and indeed these very terms, pertain to the *ordo salutis* of a developed *Bhakti* doctrine of salvation; and this is the real reason for their repetition in the present context where, in fact, the *bhaktas'* ideal in its typical form is described exactly:—of men who, having withdrawn from worldly affairs, spend their lives in the pious conventicles of the later *vaishnavas*, studying together the sacred Word of the Lord,

singing holy songs, reading, expounding and preaching the hallowed narratives that had been composed in the interval and “enlightening one another”. In them *Bhakti* fervently glows and the Lord, dwelling in their own souls, imparts to them by His unmerited grace (*ahetuka prasāda*) the light of the redeeming *jñāna*. But not by a single word does Arjuna indicate, in Chapter XI. 1-3, that any such sublime instruction has been given him; if, however, *The Original Gītā* had actually included any teaching at all about the *way of salvation*, this would have been the most important of all Krishna’s doctrines that Arjuna would ever have heard; under no conditions, therefore, could it have failed to appear in his own summary of what he had been taught in xi. 1-3. The interpolation of x. 9-11, in fact, was suggested by the conclusion of the preceding v. 8:—“Whoso has insight knows this”—that is, “from Me everything arises”. “And he worships Me, impressed by awe.” This could certainly provide the starting-point for a general discussion of *Bhakti*; in itself, however, v. 8 is directed against Arjuna’s folly, which is contrasted with the *bhāva* of one endowed with insight; and here *bhāva* means the humble and devout emotion¹ which is aroused by the consciousness of Omnipotence.

The same hand also composed vv. xviii. 62-65, 67-71, necessary as these were to bring the close of *The Original Gītā* to a typically *Bhakti* culmination; they include the usual and conventional “fruit of hearkening” (*śravana-phala*), but they have nothing whatever to do with Krishna’s specific task of converting into obedience the mood of one who has no desire to fight. Nor is there any reference to them in Arjuna’s own response in v. 73; there is no consciousness that he has been chosen for the highest bliss, nor that the supreme favour of salvation has been vouchsafed to him, but simply that his perplexity as to his duty has been

¹ In Apte’s *Dictionary* *bhāva* is translated by “devotion”.

removed, and that he will now fulfil the command to fight. But if he had been initiated into mysteries such as those of v. 68, how vastly different must his words inevitably have been!

TREATISE II: THE GĪTĀ, XIV-XV: The Development of Qualified Monism, (*viśiṣṭādvaitam*), with *Sāṅkhya* Doctrine as the subordinate stage.

(1). The previous Treatise was characterized by its wholly unspeculative attitude, which culminates in completely subordinating the exalted *Yoga*, together with the elevated metaphysics of the Universe and of God, to the plain and homely piety of humble trust which renounces both practice and the lofty flights of thought alike. This, however, is not the standpoint of *bhaktas* in general, since they too have devoted themselves to various forms of speculation and elaborated theoglico-metaphysical systems. They have in this way, therefore, and like theologians everywhere, come to an understanding with the speculative thought of their own day, have appropriated its methods, its presumed or actual results, and attempted (with the necessary alterations and suppressions) to give it a place within their own religious creed; and thus, at a very early stage, they sought to make even the "most scientific" of all Indian systems, the *Sāṅkhya*, useful and serviceable in their own way, just as did the strict non-dualists (*advaitins*). Certainly they were *bhaktas*, for to them also not *jñāna* is the highest, but *Bhakti*; nevertheless they were profoundly influenced by the ancient estimate of *jñāna*—of elevated metaphysical knowledge about the Universe, men and God—which they regarded as being itself one condition of *Bhakti*. Of this general standpoint *The Gītā*, XIV-XV, is a compendium; and it is obviously very different from the former attitude. I shall therefore call this association of the two viewpoints *Sa-Sāṅkhya-Bhakti*, in contradistinction to the *Bhakti*

which has been found to culminate in plain *Prapatti*. The contrast between them, then, is that for the one all lofty *jñāna* is definitely a matter of indifference, since to it the dictum applies that "Love of the Lord is better than much knowledge", while the other maintains that man must undeniably know a great deal: he must know about the concatenation of the entangling *gunas*, their difference from the spirit which subsists at a level higher than their own, the relations between Spirit and Matter, and between both of these and God. For it, still further, such knowledge is in itself power, though not the ultimate redeeming Power For in the end it is *Bhakti* that saves, in so far as release from the *guna* fetters is effected by means of *Bhakti*, while it is only in this that all *jñāna* finally finds its own completion

Thus the great *Bhakti* theologian Rāmānuja maintained that *jñāna*, as an intellectual activity, cannot free from the bonds of desire; only *Bhakti*, in the guise of feeling, can do that; nor again can *jñāna*, as mere knowledge, bring about union with God; this too can be attained only through *Bhakti*, as love. In exactly the same sense the *Sāndilya Sūtra*, I, 2, 1 ff., explains that *jñāna* and *Yoga* also are merely the *means* to *Bhakti*, which is itself the real preparation (*upāya*). "For everyday life and experience teach us that *knowledge* about beauty is doubtless the accompaniment of a maiden's *affection* for a youth, but not conversely." (And *Yoga*, as *upāya*, is subordinated to *jñāna*) Similarly I. I, 2:—"Mere knowledge may be possessed by one who nevertheless feels antipathy to the Lord". So, too, in the present Treatise: Knowledge is certainly praised, but *Bhakti* possesses ultimate value: xv. 19.

(2). It is, at the same time, readily understandable that *Bhakti* religion should become associated with *Sāṅkhya*, intrinsically alien though this is in its very nature. For to all profound faith in God, if it is at the same moment belief in redemption, there necessarily pertains a belief in the

soul, while the idea of redemption is specifically connected with the contrast between whatever becomes a fetter on the one hand, and on the other the Being Who releases from this bondage:—an antithesis which the *Sāṅkhya* had elaborated more acutely than the old *Vedānta*.

(3). It is at once evident, still further, that the Treatise under consideration is an independent production, and not simply a continuation by the author who had just written Chapter XIII. For this Chapter is in itself a well-rounded *whole*; and whoever composed it did not proceed, in Chapters XIV–XV, to discuss the same topics as though he had said nothing at all about them already. Conversely, the writer of Chapters XIV–XV was not himself the author of Chapter XIII, since this would have involved his anticipating himself in the most purposeless manner possible. What actually happened, then, is easily understood:—the concise treatment of the subject in Chapter XIII failed to satisfy some later author, who consequently inserted his own ideas in such a way as to complete and enhance the work, and at the same time in what seemed to him a better order and more in conformity with his own aims and viewpoints.

— (4). Finding Chapter XIII, then, already widely accepted, the redactor annexed to it his own well-constructed and rounded-off Treatise, beginning Chapter XIV with the stereotyped assurance that, by way of contrast with all that precedes, he will reveal the “highest” knowledge which alone will lead to “highest” perfection; and his concluding words in xv. 20 correspond most precisely to this editorial Introduction:—“Thus have I declared to thee this highest secret doctrine”—already proclaimed in xiv. 1 as “the highest knowledge”.—“Whoso understands this has done what alone has to be done.” All that intervenes between his Preface and his final words is intended to form an independent Treatise; and this it actually is. Excellently

constructed, the Treatise consists of five subdivisions, with a short Introduction.—

The Introduction: XIV. 1, 2: the exalted goal is *Bhakti*, as the concluding verse xv. 19 maintains in summing up the discussion; but *Bhakti* itself presupposes knowledge: one must be “sustained by knowledge” (xiv. 2), which, again, must be communicated to others. He who supports himself in this way attains salvation.¹

Section (I).—What then is this knowledge? Evil owing to the bondage of the *gunas*: 3-18. First of all human *evil* must be known to consist in worldly bondage in *samsāra*; this arises because the seed of life, or the spirit, which is cast into Matter by God, immediately becomes fettered in this world owing to the *gunas*, or constituents of Matter, which are regarded as “snares”²; and the Chapter proceeds to describe their interconnections and reciprocal influence, together with their separate characteristics. According to the preponderance of one or another of these *gunas*, man either rises or falls on the ladder of the soul’s pilgrimage; but he is never released from it.

¹ Salvation consists in *sādharmaṇyam* with God, to employ a popular term of developed *Bhakti* theology. Whoever is redeemed, that is to say, does not become God, but is “deified” in so far as he acquires “equivalent existential predicates” with God. In other words, he attains *bhāva*, the mode of Being of God (“excluding rule over the Universe”); and all this definitely does not mean Identity with God, *cf.* pp. 127, 221.

² Here Matter is called “*Brahman*”. On the one hand *Brahman* was the *causa activa* which brings the Universe, with its Form, into existence, and on the other the *causa materialis* of the World, or that upon which the Form of the Universe is bestowed. In the present context, God has assumed the first of these two rôles, so that *Brahman* now remains only as *causa materialis*, and thereupon becomes a synonym for *Prakṛiti*: so also in *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* III, 26, 11, and occasionally too in *Sāṅkhya* Treatises. In *Bhakti* theology the Universe that has been produced is sometimes called the *Prapañca-Brahman* (*Brahman* as Multiplicity), as in *Śāṇḍilya Samhitā*, v, 2, 5. “*My Brahman*”, it runs, because here too both World and World-material are regarded as originating from the Being of God Himself.

Section (II).—How, in the next place, does man obtain freedom from the evil of *samsāra*? XIV. 19-27.

An answer to this is first of all given, but very incautiously, in accordance with the style of the *Sāṅkhya* doctrine that had been incorporated: “By recognizing his own self as distinct from the *gunas*, and from Matter”.¹ This response, however, is at once improved upon: for just as though no reply whatever had yet been offered to the question as to how release is gained, the fundamental problem of salvation is formulated in *v.* 21:—

How does he surmount these three *gunas*?

and with this the further enquiry is straightway associated:—What is the nature of him who is freed from the *gunas*? or in technical terms: What are the essential characteristics of the *jīvanmukta*?—of him who achieves perfection in the present life?

XIV. 22-25 constitutes the reply to the latter, although it is certainly very meagre and strictly confined to pure *Sāṅkhya* ideas; but this response too is at once outbidden. For redemption in itself, both that to be experienced in this life and its eternal phase described in *v.* 2, is depicted in terms of obvious *Bhakti* doctrine. Not *jñāna*, not *Sāṅkhya* knowledge about the difference between *Purusha* and *Prakṛti* has redeeming power, despite the incautious terms of *vv.* 19-20, but “he truly surmounts these *gunas* who serves Me in *Bhakti* discipline and without erring, and is thus fit for the *Brahma* mode of Being” (XIV. 26).

¹ This is clumsy dallying with the foreign material that had been incorporated, but which had its own native character and with which the author was not yet quite familiar. Formally this Treatise agrees with Treatise VI, which has still to be dealt with. Just as, in the latter, the technical *Yoga* is inserted into *Bhakti* theology as a kind of preliminary stage, so in the present instance is one type of *Sāṅkhya*; and in both alike the added material is somewhat refractory.

This last is *possible*, because (27):—“Upon *Me* reposes *Brahman*, and likewise the changeless immortality, the eternal law”—in accordance with which salvation is imparted—“and absolute happiness”.

Garbe placed the last two verses in brackets; but, in my opinion, quite unjustifiably; and his view is refuted by *v. 21*, which he himself accepted. For if *vv. 26, 27* are omitted, the really outstanding question of *v. 21*, “How does he surmount these three *gunas*?”, undeniably remains unanswered. But Garbe was misled by his suspicion that *Advaita* interpolations occurred wherever the terms *Brahman* and *Brahman-Bhāva* appear. Verse 2 represents salvation as being *equality* with God, whereas the expressions employed in *v. 26* are feebler than this equivalence to God rather than stronger. How convenient the prolonged use of the term *Brahman* proved itself to be is shown by the fact that, in what precedes, *Prakriti* itself could be called the “great *Brahman*” of God (*v. 5*). Certainly both *Brahma-Bhāva* and *Brahma-Nirvāna* meant, for the present author, no more and no other than something equivalent to the familiar “eternal bliss”.¹ And quite obviously *Brahman* and *Brahma-Bhāva* are here regarded as being *dependent* on God, and therefore as subordinated to Him; *Brahma-Bhāva* is simply the “wondrous state” which man attains when he enters upon eternal freedom from death and equality with God.

Section (III).—The Tree of Evil and its Felling: xv. 1-6.
An ancient hymn about the Tree of Evil, which must be hewn down, and about the “supreme abode” of salvation,

¹ In the *Moksha-dharma*, *Brahma-Bhāva* is often enough simply an expression for the state of inward concentration and peace of soul in general; and Roy rightly translates this term not, as Garbe did, by “become a brahman” but by “state of *Brahman*”, or condition of *Brahman*, *brāhmī sthitis*, a Brahmic state marvellous and superior to the world and to *samsāra* in general, without any more precise definition.

is cited here and briefly explained, in order to substantiate what has been said already.

The trunk of this tree is like a cluster of thick strands (Hill) and is therefore an impressive image for the entanglement of the *gunas*—“strands”—the mazes of which constitute the material world and “the things” therein. The tree is the tree of worldly existence. It originates from the Deity, and hence its roots are “above”, while since it extends into the world, its trunk and branches go “downwards”.

According to ancient belief, the existence of the world is sustained by the magic of the Vedic sacrificial cult, operating through the “songs” of the *Veda*; these, therefore, are its “leaves” which, as the organs of respiration, keep the trunk and its branches alive. But it is not he who knows these songs and can apply them to the continued *maintenance* of the tree, but he who recognizes its character as the tree of *evil* and *hews it down*, that is the true “knower of the *Veda*”, in the sense that he alone possesses the sacred knowledge which is actually involved; cf. *The Sanatsujātaparvan*, 42, 51¹—“For the sacred songs originate from clinging to one’s own desires”, and *The Anugītā*, 19, 8²: “. . . the perishable world, comparable to the fig tree, evermore bound to birth, old age and death”. Similarly *The Anugītā*, vv. 954b ff., includes the same ancient hymn of the Tree of Evil and its antithesis, “the Eternal Abode”:

(i). The Tree of Evil:

“There is a great (tree), sprung from an invisible root: it has *buddhi* as its trunk, the great *ahamkāra* for branches, the senses as its shoots and cavities, the great elements as its separate parts and the elemental qualities as its boughs; it continually bears leaves and blossoms and incessantly produces evil fruits. It is eternal, giving life to the beings that have sprung from *Brahman* as the root. He who has recognized it (in its evil nature) and has hewn off its *tattvas*

¹ Deussen, p. 17.

² *ibid.*, p. 898.

with the most excellent sword of knowledge, attains to freedom from death and casts from him death and rebirth ” (2). The Eternal Abode:

“But now I shall declare to thee the Highest Abode, which is the origin of all that is present, past and future, which is the abiding goal (beyond desert, pleasure and gain), well known to the hosts of *siddhas*, everlasting from the earliest days.”

Here too this Section is a fragment, and the promised description of the Eternal Abode abruptly curtailed. Nevertheless it differs from the version in *The Gītā* in containing no reference to *guna* doctrine.

Section (IV) —The Metaphysics of the Doctrine of Evil and Salvation: xv. 7-18 (omitting 12-15); the metaphysical theory of the Whole is advanced in the form of a developing *Viśiṣṭādvaita*, or philosophic system of qualified Monism, as it became more definitely expressed by Yāmunamuni in his *Siddhitraya*, and still further elaborated by Rāmānuja. Originally, as we know already, the total Universe of Being streamed forth from God Himself; and in the latter system the soul is an actual *amśa*, a broken-off portion of God Himself, which becomes a real or substantial and individual soul in the world and falls into bondage because it enters the “service” of the objects of sense. Thus the Universe, as existing over against God, consists of the two essences which are subsequently distinguished as the *ātman* and the *jada* (inanimate), being in xv. 16 contrasted with each other as the immutable (the *ātman*) and the mutable (the material). High above them stands the Supreme, in serene transcendence over the Universe, yet at the same time immanently permeating it.

xv. 12-15: Here again we observe the prophylactic method of the Glossographer; for in vv. 16-18 the sharpest conceivable contrast between Nature, Spirit and God is to be drawn. In order to impart to the reader then, and in

advance, the intended immunizing association, the author of this Gloss skilfully presents a selection of quotations which arouse a mood for which the contrasts between identity, transcendence and immanence become nebulous.

Section (V).—Concluding Summary: xv. 19, 20, then draws the conclusion. He who is lost in *samsāra* should be concerned with the knowledge of these facts, hidden from the deluded eye, and especially with the knowledge of this Highest Being as the goal. He who has this “possesses complete knowledge”, that is to say, he knows all that is necessary for redemption. By such knowledge he must be “sustained”, as in xiv. 2. The purpose of this knowledge, however, is nothing but *Bhakti*.

Finally, xv. 20 (to repeat) clearly refers to the opening verse of the Treatise in xiv. 1, and provides its conclusion as a separate and independent whole.

Quite correctly, Garbe excluded *vv. 12-15*, which perfectly obviously interrupt the well-arranged context by forcing *v. 16* out of its close and necessary connection with the passage 7-11. What the author of this Treatise intends first of all to describe is the *Universe* as existing over against God, and consisting of *ātman* and Matter; and it is only *after* his doctrine about the Universe that he discusses the doctrine of God, so that his theology follows his cosmology. The composer of the Gloss in question, on the other hand, suddenly and without any motive interpolates a theological passage in the middle of the cosmology. But what purpose this digression about God is intended to serve it is impossible to understand, still less what the explanations of juicy *soma* and digestive fire mean. His design, nevertheless, is obvious: he intends as far as possible to *obviate* and weaken the sharp dualism which *vv. 16* and *17* postulate between the Universe and God, Who is here conceived as rigorously transcending the Universe, and to induce the reader to interpret the “immutable” of *v. 16* on the analogy of the

ideas of immanence in *vv.* 12-15. The author of the Treatise himself speaks quite consistently of God only from *v.* 17 onwards, and the style of *vv.* 12-15 is not at all in harmony with that of his own theology. But even if anyone felt inclined to assume that our author, as a *visiṣṭādvaitin* maintaining a qualified Monism, might after all have utilized ancient immanence maxims, surely he cannot be considered capable of so confusing his own clear construction as to insert these verses so aimlessly between the closely connected *vv.* 11 and 16, where they are completely out of place, instead of attaching them to *v.* 17, where he himself speaks of "Īśvara, who enters therein"! There cannot, then, be the slightest doubt that here we find a glossographer whose personal characteristics are as strongly marked as is his ineptitude. This Gloss itself, nevertheless, remains important for us because it enables us to perceive extraordinarily clearly the specific signature of the Vedic Gloss composer, so that it can be readily recognized in other passages also.

TREATISE III: THE GĪTĀ, XVI-XVIII. 49.

This Treatise consists of two Sections (*A*) and (*B*) which, while interconnected in their content, are nonetheless independent, although they are combined together in an obviously clumsy fashion by XVII. 1.

(*A*). Chapter XVI. Plain, unsectarian, religious, moralizing, characterized by the pronounced dualism of the *devic* and *asuric* natures.

This, though devoid of any special instructional or sectarian character, is a straightforward *Wisdom Treatise* containing theistic and ethical doctrine, similar to that found in *The Moksha-dharma*.¹ Observance of "the Law", as this presented itself to the cultured Hindu of those days in its general principles and apart from any special techni-

¹ *cf.* the polemic against the *Nāstikas* (Nihilists) *vv.* 15 *ff.*

calities, is to be strenuously inculcated, although at the same time, of course, as being the way of release (v. 5). The usual virtues of a devout Hindu are associated together as a "godly" state of life (a: 1-5); and opposed to all this is the catalogue of vices, including doubt of God and the divine world government, together with the naturalistic interpretation of the Universe (*Nāstika*—nihilistic—Hedonism) (b: 6-19). The prospects of punishment for such "demonic" conduct, and of reward for "godly" living, are discussed in vv. 20-23. From v. 18, again, it would appear that the spiritual self is regarded as being in some way identical with God, although no consequences bearing on the doctrine of salvation are inferred from this. The final verse: "let holy writ be established as thy standard", provides the obvious conclusion, and at the same moment the essential feature, of the whole position.

Characteristic of this brief but beautiful *Wisdom Treatise* is the sharply *dualistic* contrast, which seems to be almost Parsiistic, between the *devic* and the *asuric* nature, noticeably different as this is from the *trialism* of the next Treatise (B) with its wholly divergent orientation. Its own trend exhibits no acquaintance with the *guna* doctrine of its successor, nor with *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* (either technical or Character-*Yoga*), nor again with *Bhakti*, redemption through *Bhakti*, nor mystical union. It inculcates fulfilment of the usual *dharma*, and a generalized pious type of demeanour which is nowhere more closely defined; this leads to the goal and the happiness of the next world (v. 24), but without it being specifically declared what this is or wherein it consists. In this respect too this short *Text* resembles Vyāsa's sermon to Śuka.

(B). Chapters XVII-XVIII. 49 (omitting xvii. 23-28; xviii. 13-17, 45, 46). The *threefold* association of the ancient moral doctrine of the three *gunas* with the ideal of the condition attained in *sattva*.

As definitely as is possible, this Treatise expresses both its essential principle and its conclusion in XVIII. 49:—"By *Sannyāsa*, (that is to say) when one's mind is free from attachment as regards all things, when he is self-restrained and has been released from desire, he attains the highest goal, that is, freedom from *Karman*".

Here, therefore, the goal is not really *Brahman* mysticism in its proper form, not entering into the Lord, nor *Yoga*-self-experience, but the wholly prosaic freedom from *Karman* and its fettering, fateful power of Destiny and, together with this, release from *samsāra* and return. The Section recognizes and suggests nothing more, while like the preceding Treatise it prescribes a simple religious doctrine about virtue. But in place of the dualism of the earlier passages, it maintains the essentially distinct and differently oriented trialism of *guna* doctrine, elaborating this in an extremely systematic way; and at the same time its three-fold system of virtue, defect and vice is developed in accordance with the outstanding problem and controversies which probably agitated its own day:—What actually is correct belief and proper diet? sacrifice, asceticism, almsgiving, etc., together with the question which evidently stirred men's minds most profoundly—What is true *Sannyāsa* and *Tyāga*? At this stage the newer tendency enters the fray; in the homely moral attitude it perceives something superior to the ancient penitential ideal, while at the same moment it recognizes that precisely in this ethical standpoint there is involved a veritable surrender and renunciation of a higher order, that very *Sannyāsa*, in fact, which the concluding verse extols as the ideal and the path to ultimate redemption. It proceeds therefore, logically and systematically, to discuss the questions and disputed issues of knowledge, of action and the doer of actions, the power of judgment and the force of decision, endurance and true happiness, and the co-ordinated spheres of activity in caste work, until

in the concluding verse (xviii. 49) it lucidly sums up its completed doctrine in its spiritualized *Sannyāsa* ideal.

Taken in its entirety, this Treatise also is thoroughly unsectarian and free from scholasticism, even though the author *may* have made use of the specific *Sāṅkhyā* doctrine in xviii. 13-17; these verses, however, obviously distort the context. For the tendency of the whole discourse is definitely not towards these explicit *Sāṅkhyā* principles—to attain for oneself the knowledge that the *Purusha* is not, properly speaking, the doer and that the play of the *gunas* does not affect it; much more, in xviii. 26-28, is the agent regarded as himself the subject, while all the emphasis of the exhortation falls on the truth that *sattva* itself is the actual ideal, and not any specific knowledge about the *Purusha*. No genuine *sāṅkhyā* could summarize his principles as has been done in xviii. 49; this author, however, knows the *guna* doctrine and develops it quite logically. Nonetheless do I think that it is seriously incorrect to place this system without more ado on the same level as the *Sāṅkhyā*; on the contrary, the ancient *guna* principles seem to me to have become, within the *Sāṅkhyā* system, diverted from their own original tendency. For if *sattvam* is opposed to *rajas* and *tamas*—to gloom and darkness—then surely something was originally intended that was not, like *rajas* and *tamas*, included in what must be *overcome*, but much rather the ideal itself, the true, ultimate and specific Being, both actually and normatively, in accordance with the ideal, not some “binding” factor of “Nature”. Some such original conception of *sattva* as being in itself the actual ideal, as releasing from *samsāra* and not forging new bonds to it, still remains clearly visible in Section 224 of *The Sāntiparvan*: “The sinless one attains the attributes of *sattvam*. But to those who depart from *sattvam* are allotted successive rebirths”. Similarly 157¹:—“I take my

¹ Roy's Translation, pp. 13, 14

refuge in the *sattva-guna*.—Now have I entered into *Brahman*. I have entered the eternal city of *Brahman*".

Here, then, *sattvam* is not something which, like *rajas* and *tamas*, can be *stripped off*, but the ideal ultimate condition, as such; and *The Anugītā* (v. 1343) proves that such an ancient doctrine had actually existed, for which *sattvam*, as "the highest", was contrasted with *rajas* and *tamas*.¹ From the *Sāṅkhya* standpoint, therefore, this exaltation of *sattvam* must have appeared as its identification with the "knower of the field" (*Kshetrajña*), exactly as this verse maintains:—"Some learned men, who are well versed in knowledge, maintain the unity of the *Kshetrajña* and *sattvam*". And although this doctrine is rejected, still its previous existence is attested, and this in terms of respect² for its representatives. In v. 1339, in fact, we are illogically and even quite naïvely assured that—"there is nothing that is higher than *sattvam*, and those who *know* it on Earth praise it as being the highest".²

The Gītā, xviii, vv. 13-17, obviously interrupt the pervading strict rhythm of the present Treatise, which knows nothing whatever of any distinction between the knower of the field (*Kshetrajña*) and the *sattva-guna*; and this implies, still further, that it is completely unaware of the specific *Sāṅkhya* doctrine. The intrusion, then, is due to the "stimulus" of v. 18, in which, however, the

¹ This of course does not exclude the fact that the name *Sāṅkhya* is very old, while the ancient teachers of the three-guna doctrine were themselves called *sāṅkhyas*. On the other hand, any reference to specific *Sāṅkhya* principles must imply solely the definite tenet of the difference between the "knower of the field", and "the field" itself (*Kshetrajña* and *Kshetra*), together with the attainment of "salvation" not so much by any moral conduct as substantiating *sattva*, but rather by the intellectual activity of differentiating (*viveka*) between *Kshetrajña* and *Kshetra*.

² Deussen's Translation, p. 683; cf. *The Gītā*, ii. 45b, "nitya-sattva-sihas". Here a *nitya-sattvam* is opposed to the *guna sattvam* in 45a.

“knower” is himself quite naively recognized as the cause of action. Prophylactically, once again, this *Sāṅkhya* Gloss attempts to neutralize this belief by employing the previous preventive device.

These verses appear to me, therefore, as an insertion by some *Sāṅkhya* interpolator who found, in *v.* 18, knowledge together with the object of knowledge and the knower as the conditions of “action”; so in order to effect an opportune immunization, in accordance with his own doctrine, of these terms, though they are not employed at all in the *Sāṅkhya* sense in the present context, he interpolates in advance (in *vv.* 13-17) a learned citation from some *Sāṅkhya* Treatise. But by this device he destroys the obvious meaning of the actual writer of the Treatise, since he perceived the conditions of action certainly not in the five factors to which the interpolator himself appeals, but precisely in knowledge itself, together with the object known and the knower, as the natural and universal presuppositions of every act. The “one” essence in *v.* 20, again, is in no way whatever recognizable as being the *Prakṛiti* of the *sāṅkhyas* (as Garbe suggested) but is an avowal of that Naturalistic Monism which is the universal background of non-sectarian Hindu sentiment.

The present Treatise, still further, is closely related to the internally homogeneous Section of *The Anugītā*, Chapters 26-28, which also expounds an ancient three-*guna* doctrine, although *Sāṅkhya* principles as such do not characterize these passages either. Not in the speculative distinction between the *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛiti*, to which not a single reference is made, but (exactly as in *The Gītā* Treatise now under discussion) here too the way to the highest goal is found and pursued in moral behaviour through the *sattva-guna*. Only in the closing verse (1057) can any hint of genuine *Sāṅkhya* ideas be discerned, and even there it remains very indefinite. But the actual trend of thought in the Section

itself is completely free from all this, and may indeed originate in the very circles of those *guna* teachers who (in v. 1343) are extolled and recognized as “well versed in knowledge”, though they were obviously not *sāṅkhyas*¹

The introductory verse of the present Treatise (*B*) (xvii 1) is the typical patchwork of an Editor who felt himself impelled to connect (*B*) to (*A*). He attempts to stitch together, to some extent, what is said about *Faith* at the commencement of Treatise (*B*) with the concluding words of the preceding Treatise about the *Law*, by the method of appealing to Arjuna’s ostensible enquiry as to how a man is to be judged who certainly has Faith, but does not observe the Law:—a question with which not one single word of *what follows* is concerned. Arjuna asks at the same time about the incorporation of this form of behaviour within the three-*guna* schema to which, however, there is no reference of any kind in *what precedes*, while the succeeding three-*guna* schema takes no account at all of the problem of “faith without works”, but regards Faith from a wholly different point of view; Arjuna’s question, therefore, is left hanging altogether in the air.

¹ Deussen translates v. 1000—*akrite kritamānītvam, ajñāne jñāna-mānītā*—as “imagining that one does something, when one does nothing”, a rendering in which the verse may well resemble the *Sāṅkhya* doctrine of the false attribution of action to the *Kshetra-jñāna*. The line actually means, however:—“those who believe that they accomplished something, whereas they have accomplished nothing, and that they possessed knowledge whereas they have none”. Since the demand is that one *ought* to have genuine knowledge, so quite naturally it is required that one *ought* to have actually done something right and fitting, and not be satisfied with the mere conceit of having accomplished something. In other words action—that is to say *sattva* action—is here categorically *demanded*, while whoever merely *imagines* that he has performed it, when actually he has done nothing whatever, is blamed. As is subsequently the case with unfriendliness, unbelief and stupidity (*amarī, aśraddhā* and *mūḍha-bhāvanā*), similarly the lack of (genuine) activity is censured here.

Garbe was therefore perfectly justified in excluding xvii. 23-28 as a Gloss; they originate from an entirely different sphere, and interrupt the well-knit course of the Treatise in the most irritating fashion. Garbe's rejection of xviii. 45, 46 seems to me to be equally correct, since the meaning of *v.* 47 is most closely connected with that of *v.* 44. The doctrine of caste actions, rigidly demarcated in accord with the three *gunas*, was bound to find its conclusion in the *Svadharma* doctrine of one's specific duty, for the sake of which the former was presumably constructed; and this interpolation clumsily anticipates the attainment of *Siddhi*, which the Treatise itself, quite rightly, was not intended to present expressly as the final and complete outcome until *v.* 49. The inserted words are undeniably beautiful; but if the present author, whose own construction is throughout carefully elaborated, had himself adopted their viewpoint, he would certainly have introduced it in *v.* 49. Nowhere, however, does his thought wander in this manner; and his own belief is that correct action possesses its power of freeing from *samsāra* not owing to God's Grace, nor again because it is done in honour of the Highest, but simply because it pertains to *sattva*.

Thus the very clear arrangement of Treatise (B) is as follows:—

Its Ultimate Theme: The attainment of freedom from *Karman*, which is equivalent to freedom from *samsāra*, as steadfastness in *sattva*.

- (1). *Faith* in accordance with *sattva*, xvii. 2-4;
- (2). *Diet*, *vv.* 7-10;
- (3). *Sacrifice*, 11-13;
- (4). *Spiritual Aseticism*, 14-19;
- (5). *True Almsgiving*, 20-22;
- (6). *Spiritual Sannyāsa*,
 - (a). *Pūrvapaksha* (Preliminary statement): Definitions of other Teachers, xviii. 2, 3;

- (b). *Siddhānta* (Canon): Krishna's own description of *Sannyāsa*, 4-12;
- (7). The Doctrine of Correct Action:
 - (a). The Conditions and Essence of all Action, 18, 19;
 - (b). Its Detailed Features:
 - Correct Knowledge, 20-22,
 - Correct Action, 23-25;
 - The Veritable Actor, 26-28;
 - True Power of Judgment, 29-32;
 - True Constancy, 33-35;
 - True Happiness, 36-39;
- (8). Correct Action as that of the Different *Castes*, based on the *Guna* Law, 40-44;
- (9). The Doctrine of Caste Action, culminating in that of specific duties, *Svadharma*, 47, 48;
- (10). Conclusion and Summary of the Whole Treatise and its Termination, 49.

This exhortation, so intrinsically coherent and so skilfully and lucidly presented, by a writer who knew exactly what he intended to say, as well as the goal at which he aimed, enables the deviations due to the Glosses to be readily detected. In conclusion, therefore, I regard xvii. 5, 6, if not as a Gloss, then as at least an interpolated Section. Certainly the polemic against excessive asceticism is itself wholly in the spirit of the author of the Treatise; if, however, it was actually written by him, then there can be no doubt that, originally, it followed *v.* 19. An author who arranges his subject matter so skilfully would not suddenly interject a totally inapposite reference to *tapas* into the middle of his disquisition on Faith and dietetic regulations, particularly not when he subsequently discusses *tapas* in detail in its proper place, where it usually and traditionally appears—between sacrifice and almsgiving. Originally, then, *vv.* 5 and 6 formed a marginal comment intended as a supplement to *v.* 19, in which self-torment is specifically

treated, being afterwards transferred from the margin of the *MS.* to its present erroneous position.

(C). *The Gītā*, XVIII. 50-57.

The utilization of the two combined subdivisions, *A* and *B*, by means of *Bhakti* soteriology. Connection with *The Original Gītā* in *vv.* 56, 57.

Treatise III, as the outcome of combining (*A*) and (*B*), actually sprang from neither *Bhakti* theology nor its characteristic attitude. In the appended *vv.* 50-57, however, it was pressed into the service of a *Bhakti* theologian, who did nothing more than associate it with the *soteriological practice* of his own particular *bhakta* tendency.

In *v.* 49, as we have just seen, the author of Treatise III had arrived at his definite conclusion; he had led up to the *Paramā Siddhi*:—the highest. But in an obviously clumsy fashion his present commentator outbids this attainment of “the highest goal” (in *v.* 49) by one still higher in *v.* 50, which is in accordance with the *Samuccaya* procedure of summation or systematic association. Just as in the later *bhakta* manuals which expound *Samuccaya* principles, technical *Yoga* and the *Jñāna-Yoga* are piled upon the *Karma-Yoga*, and then surmounted by the *Bhakti-* and *Prapatti-Yoga*, similarly at this earlier stage. Here again, however, Garbe appears to have been incorrect in finding difficulties as regards *Brahman* and *Brahma-Bhāva*. It is true that, in *vv.* 53, 54, a *Brahma* condition is recognized and discriminated; but this cannot be explained as being due to some *Advaita* theologian’s attempt at timid correction: if indeed he had done this, his device would have been at once frustrated by what follows; if then he wished to interpolate any rectification, from his own point of view he could insert this only *after v.* 55, but certainly not *before*. For he would have been compelled to describe the *Brahma-Bhāva* as a terminus, not as a thoroughfare; and what actually occurred here is just the reverse—that is the

forcible device of a *bhakta*, which was intended to *subordinate* the ancient *Brahman* itself to the idea of *Īśvara*.

It seems quite feasible at this stage to trace the history of attempts of this sort, since it appears possible to discern the actual course followed by such methods. *Brahman*, then, as originally a secret and magic sacrificial power, was at an early stage (and apparently *before* it became itself regarded as the primary Principle) conceived as *someone's* power—that is of one of the superior gods (or of a priest-magician) who *possessed* and could employ it; a *Brahmanas-pati* is a being of this type—a possessor and lord of *Brahman* who has it at his own disposal. In *Harivamśa*, 172, for example, *Brahman* is the *tejas*, the magical brilliance, of *Vāsudeva*, surrounding him like a glowing sphere of flame and power, into which other beings can enter. The Poem recounts Arjuna's journey with Krishna, during which he sees strange miracles performed; the sea changes into a solid road, the mountains open, and they enter a gleaming cloud of heat and radiance. On his return home, Arjuna asks Krishna to explain these marvels and how he was able to produce them. In reply Krishna says:—“That which is of the type of *Brahma-tejas*, which thou hast seen, is I myself. That is my eternal *tejas*. My highest nature, manifested yet unmanifested, it is eternal. Entering into this, the excellent knowers of *Yoga* are redeemed.

“Know me alone as this highest *tejas*. This my highest nature is the goal of the *sāṅkhyas*, and of the *yogins* also, and likewise of those who practise *tapas*. As the highest abode, this (*tejas*) is *Brahman*, and permeates the whole Universe.”¹

Similarly in *Harivamśa* 11,751, *Brahman* is described simply as the *tejas* of *Vishnu*: *brahma ca vaishnavam tejas vedoktair vacanaiḥ*:—“Brahma is the *tejas* of Vishnu through the words uttered by the *Vedas*”. Likewise for the *Bhakti*

¹ 172, 9763 ff.

theologian, Caitanya, *Brahman* is the radiant glow, the brilliance, of Being surrounding Bhagavat, into which those enter who have not been able to find the perfect *Bhakti* way, being thus a kind of foretaste of Heaven, as in *The Gitā*, XII. 4. Here the comparison is drawn:—

Just as the coarse eye of man, being dazzled, can see the sun only as a globe of uniform radiance, and not as the sun-god himself with his attributes, even so do the *jñānins* of *Brahman* without distinctions (*nirviśesha-Brahman*) perceive only the unvaried radiant sphere (of God), but not Himself clearly with His attributes.

✓ There now arises, however, a further consideration. For *Brahma-Bhāva* and *Brahma-Bhūya*, in themselves at this stage very vaguely defined conditions which even in *Brahman* theology were open to differing interpretations, emerge from their own extremely narrow sphere of validity, the result being that just as *Brahman* can become one term for God, so *Brahma-Bhāva* can acquire the quite general meaning of the condition which was recognized at that period as the ideal—the condition, that is to say, of complete spiritual concentration and artless simplicity for which the *yogin* strives; and this is evidently the case in vv. 53, 54, where our *Bhakti* theologian describes one method of attaining his goal. Thus in addition to the fulfilment of the normal Ethic which he found in the Treatise he had appropriated, he now demands those specific attitudes of seclusion from the world, of solitude, meditation and the calming of the passions, from which the *Bhakti* flame ought to spring; and this wholly *preparatory* state he calls *Brahma-Bhūya*, while whoever is in this condition is styled by him a *brahma-bhūta*—that is one who exists in *Brahma-Bhāva*. In this mood of perfect inner calm—exactly as for Christian discipline in the condition of *ἡσυχία* (and here *Brahma-Bhāva* is nothing but this)—the highest (*parama*) *Bhakti* breaks forth.

And the final stage is the imparting of divine *jñāna* by

the *Bhakti* that has thus arisen. This sequence, once again, indicates a *distinctive* tendency in *Bhakti* theology, towards a conservative tradition, in which the old magical dignity of *jñāna* was still closely adhered to as being the actual means of redemption. This, however, is a tendency which is decisively opposed to that of the *Sāndilya Sūtras*, and which had already been overcome in the present Treatises I and II.

In *v.* 55 this *Bhakti* theologian had evidently expressed his own finest thought; on the other hand *vv.* 56, 57 are palpably halting, being in fact nothing but an attempt to effect a connection somehow or other with the context. In these two verses, then, the interpolator aims at achieving a close link with *The Original Gītā* (which is resumed in *v.* 58) utilizing the word *maccitta in anticipation*, and again pursuing a method with which we are already familiar; for in the context of *The Original Gītā* itself this term has quite a different meaning from that of the general *Bhakti* attitude.

It seems to me, therefore, that in *v.* 58 *maccittah* is clearly connected with Arjuna's statement (in xi. 51) that he has once again become *sacetas*, or come "to my senses". "Therefore", replies The Supreme, "direct thy *cetas* (thoughts) to Me"—be *maccittah*"; not, that is to say, merely in general terms as a *bhakta*, but rather in this definite situation, where Arjuna is not to follow his *ahamkāra*, not to pursue his own "senses" or "thoughts" but is to direct them to God's Will. Similarly in xviii. 72, where Krishna refers again to the *cetas* which Arjuna has regained and to his concentrated attention to Krishna's words:—"Hast thou heard this with attentive mind?"—with thy *cetas* directed to Me?

TREATISE IV: THE *Gītā*, XIII (omitting *vv.* 2; 4; 12-18; 27, 28; 30).

The interrelations between this Treatise and Treatise II, which succeeds it in Chapters XIV, XV, are such that it

follows from this Section alone that they were not both written by *one* author. It contains a *Sa-Īśvara-Sāṅkhya* in popular and edifying form, but with the difference that Treatise II exhibits actual features of *Bhakti* theology much more definitely than does the present Treatise. For this, strictly speaking, is influenced by *Bhakti* only in *v.* 10—and this merely in passing. Its goal of redemption and its pathway to salvation are not those of xv. 19, but emphatically the *Kaivalyam* of *Sāṅkhya*:—the isolation of the *Purusha* from *Prakṛiti* by correct *jñāna*, and in fact by knowledge not of the *Lord*, but rather of the contrast between *Purusha* and *Prakṛiti*. On the other hand, however, it is not strictly scholastic *Sāṅkhya*, but a popular application of *Sāṅkhya* ideas which have been given an edifying form; it has no genuine interest in describing the *Purusha* in its absolute isolation as pure *jñāna*; and *jñāna* itself, which according to the *Sāṅkhya* is nothing but the knowledge possessed by the isolated spirit about itself, and as devoid of all objective content, undergoes an edifying change of interpretation into the essence of virtuous spiritual behaviour (*vv.* 7-10).¹

That neither *Brahma-Nirvāna* nor departure to the *Lord* is the goal of salvation, but precisely isolation from the material world, with its ecstasy (*Kaivalyam*), is declared by the final and culminating verse of the Treatise in the clearest and plainest words (*v.* 34):—“They who know the difference”—the *viveka* of *Sāṅkhya*—precisely in so doing “go to the highest goal”. The Treatise is constructed most lucidly and consistently with this ultimate result in view, and thus the concluding sentence itself provides a canon for the discrimination of obvious interpolations.

¹ This, still further, corresponds in all respects to the new interpretation which *jñāna* also receives in *Bhakti* theology, as for example from Rāmānuja. Here too *jñāna* becomes identical with concrete spiritual content and conduct of a religious-moral type. *Bhakti* itself is *jñāna*.

(1). For if the issue concerns the “difference” in question, then it must first of all be decided who are these two, thus to be distinguished from one another—on the one hand “the knower of the field (*Purusha*)” with his “power” (*jñāna*), and on the other “the field (*Prakriti*)” itself; and *v.* 1 states this problem. But then *v.* 2 becomes quite meaningless, and is undoubtedly a Vedantic interpolated correction, since what it clumsily anticipates can be inferred (as is in fact the case) only after the field has first of all been described. Actually then, and in perfect accord with the presentation of the theme, there follows in the first place the description of the field (*vv.* 3–6, omitting *v.* 4), and afterwards that of the *knower* of the field and his “power” or *jñāna* (*vv.* 7–11).

Verses 12–18, again, are Vedantic insertions by an interpolator who remains, nonetheless, quite unconscious of his own unskilful additions. Certainly “what should be known” (to which he refers in *v.* 12) is in the present Treatise, and in agreement with its final culminating sentence, by no means *Brahman*, but rather the distinction in question here between the “field” and the “knower of the field”; so that if the author of the Treatise had himself regarded *Brahman* as being the goal of salvation, then his concluding sentence, expressing as it does pure *Sāṅkhya* doctrine, must have completely misled his readers.

(2). In the next place, the theory of the distinction between the field and the power of the field-knower, contained in *vv.* 1–11, is still further developed in *vv.* 19–23; and in *v.* 23 the fruit of this knowledge is described, and once again in such a way that the result of salvation—not being reborn, that is to say, or freedom from *samsāra*—is attained purely through this very knowledge, and without the slightest reference to the mysteries in the interpolation *vv.* 12–18.

This is followed by the brief statement, in *vv.* 24, 25, how

the knowledge of this field-knower is obtained, while *vv. 26-33* (but omitting *27, 28, 30*) inculcate anew that, in spite of the pervasive connection between the *Purusha* and *Prakṛiti*, and the resultant confusion of these with each other which inevitably forces itself upon the ordinary mind, the inert *Purusha* must be regarded as completely separate from *Prakṛiti*, which alone is active; and they extol the “knower of the field” (*Kṣetrajña*) for his spotlessness and illuminating power¹, while *v. 34*, evidently in the closest connection with the warning of *v. 29*, but without the slightest reference to the interpolated *v. 30*, asserts that he who perceives “even so” attains thereby the very highest goal.

With reference to *v. 4*, it is obvious that this *Purusha*, here depicted in purely *Sāṅkhya* terms, is not celebrated in the *Brahma Sūtra* songs; whence it follows that this verse is an awkward interpolation; *vv. 27, 28*, again, simply tear apart *vv. 26* and *29*, which are actually as closely associated as the two halves of an egg, and should likewise be expunged; and this is equally true of *v. 30*, in which some Vedantic glossographer, with unusual tenacity, has sought to domesticate a *Sāṅkhya Text*. But the old *Text* amply justifies itself by its own closely knit structure and by the extremely precise presentation of the goal in *vv. 23* and *34*.

The obvious arrangement of the Treatise, then, is as follows:—

- (i). The Field, and the “power” of the Knower of the Field: *vv. 1, 3.*
 - (a). Description of the Field: *5, 6.*
 - (b). Description of the “power” of the Field-knower, or *jñāna* *7-II.*
- (ii). The Relation between the Two, and the Cause of Evil: *19-22.*

¹ Garbe wrongly excluded *vv. 31-33*; they are pure *Sāṅkhya* doctrine.

(III). The Way to Salvation.

- (a). Saving Knowledge: 23.
- (b). How This is Gained: 24, 25.
- (c). In What it Consists: 26, 29, 31-33.
- (d). Its Goal of Salvation: 34.

CHAPTER VI

THE TREATISES OF THE FIRST PART OF *THE GĪTĀ*: V-VIII

THE Treatises discussed in the preceding Chapter compose the *second* half of *The Gītā*. In these, on the one hand, many similar features are repeated, a fact that in itself leads to the presumption that they are not the work of any single writer, since one and the same author would never repeat himself so aimlessly; on the other hand, they include obviously different types of doctrine, which intensifies the necessity of concluding that more than one writer was concerned. The occasional addresses to Arjuna, which are intended to connect all this material to the schema of *The Original Gītā*, cannot deceive us; for as I have previously observed, the Treatises were either written with the explicit view to their incorporation in *The Original Gītā*, or they had previously been composed, and were then modified for that purpose by slight adaptations.

As regards the Treatises that still remain, I have postponed to a later stage, in the first place, the series of themes connected with the Introductory Section of *The Original Gītā*, I-II. 37; these extend to IV. 42, which definitely brings them to a conclusion with the apostrophe, "Stand up, O Bhārata", and constitute Treatise VII.¹

TREATISE V: THE GĪTĀ, v.

With the first verse of this Treatise a fresh approach is initiated. For instead of bestirring himself to fight, Arjuna now begins the enquiry about *Sannyāsa*. The general attitude adopted in this Section, nonetheless, is identical

¹ cf. p. 227.

with that of its predecessor, in which an intimate connection between *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* has been achieved. Interpolations in the *Sāṅkhya* sense had been inserted into the *Text* of *The Original Gītā*, and Character-*Yoga* discussed together with recapitulations of *Sāṅkhya* doctrines; and now Treatise V selects the relation between *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* as its own particular theme. These, it asserts, “are wholly one” (v. 5): this is the *thema probandum*. It follows the course of thought of the preceding Treatise so closely that Treatise V is merely a supplementary Appendix to VII, and *may* in fact have been written, as an addition, by the same author. In considering these features, again, the highly significant method adopted by the writer must throughout be borne in mind because, once its proper character has been ascertained, it immediately becomes a reliable criterion for discriminating the perturbations due to the Glosses which were afterwards interpolated.

The author does not advocate the wholly unreasonable view that *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* are essentially identical, being merely different names for one and the same attitude and system, but rather that they lead to the same goal—to *śānti*, or inward spiritual peace—and that in this way they enhance one another and must be practised simultaneously. In themselves, however, they are of course very different; and the author’s procedure enables him, from alternating viewpoints, to contrast the two systems with one another, in such a way that the specific peculiarity of each is presented as clearly as is their common and identical aim:—*śānti*.

The profound distinction between *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*, then, consists in this:—*Sāṅkhya* is a process of *thought*, whereas *Yoga* is an act of *will*. In *Sāṅkhya*, *jñāna* is primarily emphasized, but in *Yoga* volitional effort. For this reason *Yoga* is explicitly called *Karma-Yoga*; this, however, must not be confused with *Karma-mārga*, since it indicates the element of practical willing in *Yoga* exertion,

as distinguished from the theoretical and intellectual character of *Sāṅkhya*. In *Sāṅkhya*, that is to say, all depends on *attaining insight*, and on the repeated ratification of this insight that the *Purusha* is neither body nor senses, neither thought nor will; the *sāṅkhyā* himself continually practises the “enumeration”¹—*samkhyāna*—of the various *tattvas* of Nature, and in so doing he repeatedly substantiates the requisite insight:—*na aham, na me*. “I am not that, and that is not mine”. He solves the problem of the *Purusha*, therefore, by *thinking* away whatever is foreign to it, while the *yogin* solves it by *willing* away the alien elements; and this contrast had always subsisted in primitive magical *Yoga*. By an immense effort of will the *yogin* induces a state of inner tension, of internal “heat”, which causes the “knots” to be torn asunder so that ultimately, as though an explosion had occurred, the spirit breaks forth from its integument, and is torn out just “like an arrow-shaft out from a reed”.² Thus it is described in Śuka’s magnificent *Yoga*-discipline: an inward wrestling, a fight with clenched fists against constraining powers, a *Karman* as an intensified act of resolution and of will, are there depicted, and by mighty *volitional acts* the spirit breaks out from its bonds to fly freely in the ether. But so it is too in the later technical exercises of ordinary *Yoga*, where it is no affair of merely thinking “I am not that, and that is not mine”, but rather of powerful wrestling with the *vega* (urge) of the passions and the refractoriness of the fleeting senses, with the “convulsions” of *manas*: all this is no mere act of thought but *Karma*, a willed deed: not simply lucid *jñāna* but *vīrya*, valour. And this is equally the case with Character-*Yoga*: the deliberate conquest of inclination, energetic tearing of oneself loose from the fettering interests of life and from

¹ cf. *The Anugītā*, 1314; “while he, as one who knows the *tattvas*, enumerates these” (Deussen).

² *Katha Upanishad*, vi. 17 (Hume).

concern for work and reward, self-subjection, adequate (*daksha*) force of will, and never the *idea*—"I myself do not act" (v. 8)—constitute real Character-*Yoga*. In the highly original description of the *Yoga* method in the *Harivamśa*, xi. 736, it is said that the *yogin* must practise *nirvikārena karmanā*¹—"with *action* that knows neither remission nor difficulty"; his activity (to repeat) being an affair not so much of thought as of will, a *Karma-Yoga* rather than *Jñāna-Yoga*. Similarly *The Anugītā*, 1195,² runs:—"the essential characteristic of *Yoga* is *activity*" (which Deussen correctly explains in terms of specific technical actions such as *prāṇāyāma*—breath control—etc.).

These two methods were nevertheless bound to come into contact with one another, and could be connected together. Thus the *yogin* could accept the doctrine of the contrast between the *Purusha* and *Prakṛiti*, and incorporate the method of "thinking away" in his own discipline, while the *sāṅkhyā* could recognize the *Karman* of *Yoga* as being a preparation—an *upāya*—for the attainment of the *viveka*—of drawing this contrast. In the same way the present author compares both together, setting the one beside the other and demanding that each should supplement the other so that they should both be "one".

After presenting his *thema probandum* in v. 4, therefore, he proceeds to this comparison: in the first place, then,

(a). The Attitude of the *sāṅkhyā*, vv. 8, 9:—

The trained "philosopher"—the *tattvavid*, the knower of the *tattvas*, and therefore the *sāṅkhyā*—thinks:—"I myself do not act. For whether seeing, hearing, walking, sleeping"—and similarly in the functions of the perceptive capacities as well as the active—"he cherishes the *idea* 'only the senses function, but not I myself'".

(b). The *yogin's* Attitude, 11, 12:—

The *yogin* does not *think*, but "performs *action*"—that is

¹ cf. p. 124.

² Deussen, p. 968.

to say, the *Karman* of his discipline as well as that of daily life. Certainly in so doing he knows (as he has learnt from the *sāṅkhyas*) that he performs his actions only with his body and senses, with *manas* and *buddhi*, and not with the "self"; still it is essentially a matter of "action", not of thinking. By means of the deliberate conquest of himself, in suppressing his inclinations, he attains therefore, just as does the *sāṅkhya*, peace of soul. Thus while there are undeniably two ways there is only *one* goal. Secondly:—

(a). The Attitude of the *sāṅkhya*, 13-17:—

By means of his *thinking*, the spiritual subject casts away from himself all works. Wholly intent upon this knowledge, actually being it, in fact, and through *knowledge* free from all defilement, the *sāṅkhya* attains the goal: never to return.¹

(b). The *yogin's* Attitude again, 23 and 27-29:—

Resisting (by force of will) the powerful urge (*vega*) of desire and anger, practising the *Karman* of systematic discipline,² training himself in intently thinking about the Lord (*Īśvara-pranidhāna*),³ the *yogin* gains peace of soul: thus once again two ways, yet only one goal:—*q.e.d.*

No one could deal with his theme more skilfully, by means of this careful juxtaposition, than the author has done here; on the other hand, it would be impossible to derange so well constructed a whole more clumsily and obviously than do the Glosses in *vv.* 6, 7, 10, 18-22, 24-26.

¹ Garbe placed *vv.* 16, 17 in brackets, but quite incorrectly; the *sāṅkhyas*, in fact, are the *jñānins par excellence*; cf. p. 293.

² All this is referred to in *vv.* 23, 27, 28, and consists in *volitional acts* of discipline-*Karman*, as distinct from the mere *jñāna* of the *sāṅkhya*.

³ Certainly thoughts about God, as a method of *dhāranā*, of fixing the mind on its object, are part of the *Karman* of *Yoga*, and that is why it is mentioned here. But once again the *goal* is simply the *Kaivalyam* of *śānti*, only not now, as in *Bhakti* theology, the departure to the Lord. Thus the author of the Treatise holds fast to the very end to his *thema probandum*—that *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*, so far as their goal is concerned, are *one*; cf. Note on vi. 14.

With respect to these comparisons and distinctions, still further, its synthesis of the radically contrasted ways which share a common goal in pure *śānti*, and the moderation displayed towards a *Sāṅkhya* which (as *vv.* 16, 17, prove) is throughout regarded as an *An-Īśvara-Sāṅkhya*—*Sāṅkhya* dissociated from *Īśvara*—by which the entire Section is characterized, the Treatise in *The Śāntiparvan* 301, which is similarly self-contained, may be referred to.¹ There too the *yogin*, as one possessing mighty will power, is contrasted with the *sāṅkhya* as a man of knowledge; there too both ways are connected together. On the one hand, and in this markedly differing from Treatise V, the transcendent *Yoga* experience is elevated to the height of *Brahman* experience and universal experience. But *how* all this is effected is equally instructive: for it is not brought about by the author (so to speak) injecting his remarks sporadically, in single isolated sentences and phrases which palpably interrupt the well-ordered main structure, but in a quite systematic way at the *end* of the whole passage. In the present Treatise, on the other hand, the contrary is the case; for what, in the previous instance, is a conclusion which has its proper place and is led up to in an orderly fashion, is here arbitrarily and forcibly intruded in the form of *Glosses*. The culminating conclusion in *v.* 29, however, knows nothing about the goal of salvation in *Brahman*, but only the *śānti* of *Kaivalyam* in being ecstatically isolated from the material world.

TREATISE VI: THE GĪTĀ, VI-IX.

This Treatise presupposes its predecessor in so far as it resumes the enquiry about correct *Sannyāsa* which was there introduced, with the view to its more adequate discussion. Its standpoint, nevertheless, is obviously different from that of Treatise V, since it says not one word about

¹ In Roy's Translation, pp. 406 *ff.*

Sāṅkhyā method and the intimate association between *Sāṅkhyā* and *Yoga*. First of all it develops a pure *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* in (A), but only to erect upon it, and to expand it by, the consistent *Bhakti* doctrine in (B).

The complete set of principles of this new author is therefore clearly recognizable as that of the developing *Bhakti-Viśiṣṭa-Advaita*, and the Treatise as a whole concludes with a beautiful and fervent presentation of *Bhakti* doctrine as its outstanding feature. The *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, however, is recognized to be a preliminary stage and, as such, described in detail; and thus the Section falls into two readily distinguishable halves:—

(A). The Depiction of *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*:
and advancing beyond this:—

(B). The Presentation of *Bhakti* Theology.

(A). *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* as the Preliminary Stage: Chapter VI.

(1). In the first place, it resumes the enquiry of the preceding Section about *Sannyāsa*; then this is answered, the first sentence plainly *correcting* its predecessor, and in more precise terms than the latter. Two ways are not now to be distinguished (as in v. 2), one better and the other a worse, nor again is forbearance to be extended towards the false practice of *Sannyāsa*; rather does genuine *Sannyāsa* consist *solely* in the accomplishment of the necessary action accompanied, however, by inner freedom from striving after reward. But such renunciation is at the same time true *Yoga*, which requires no completion by means of *Sāṅkhyā*; *Yoga* being employed here mainly in the extended sense of the term, to mean firm control over oneself and steadfast inner spiritual concentration—in short, *Character-Yoga*. This more spiritual significance of *Yoga*, as the mood of complete self-possession, is more fully developed in vi. 1-9.

(2). In the next place, the systematic discipline of technical *Yoga* is presented as an additional requirement; so that

in vv. 10-22 there follows a Section which, in the main, has the typical character not of *Bhakti* theology and method, but that of mere *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*. Although this is certainly theistic, still God does not hold any really central place in it, nor is He Himself, nor essentially, the actual goal of salvation, which is here *Nirvānam*. A simple *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* of this type is first of all presented, its subdivisions (*angas*), and especially the *antar-angas* (intermediate subdivisions), being cited until v. 15 is reached; and that the thought of God is included in these (in v. 15) pertains precisely to simple *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* as such. It is the most intense fixation of the mind on its object (*dhārana*), the purpose of which is to calm and “suppress” *manas*; and in accordance with *Yoga*, the state of salvation itself is described (in vv. 20-22) as the pure *Nirvāna* of the *siddha*, without *Brahman* and without *Īśvara*. The author of these verses, therefore, could not and would not assert that *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* are one in their aim, as did the preceding writer. For in contrast to the *Kaivalya* of *Sāṅkhya*, *Nirvāna* is for him a condition of superabundant and *positive* bliss—a distinction often vigorously emphasized by *Yoga* in controversy with *Sāṅkhya*; he praises his *Nirvāna* in ecstatic terms, such as no *sāṅkhya* could ever use. On the other hand, and quite definitely, this bliss is not yet, as it is in later *Bhakti* Sections, blessedness in God, but simply the rapturous repose of the liberated spirit in itself and in its own absoluteness; it is, in other words, essentially the bliss of the *siddha*, not of the *bhakta*; and thus the author still remains wholly at the preliminary stage of mere *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, as for example in vv. 20, 21, where the self rejoices in the self, but not in God.¹

¹ This is contradicted neither by v. 14, since thinking about the Lord (*Īśvara-pranidhāna*) pertains to the *Karman* of *Yoga*, nor by the words “śāntim matsamsthām” in v. 15, which Garbe translated as “the repose which depends on Me”. That God assists towards the *yogin*’s success is indeed not denied by *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, which

(3). Verses 23–36 (omitting 27–32) proceed to discuss *helpful factors* that assist the practice of the extremely difficult *Karman* of *Yoga*, especially the obstacles confronting the novice in bringing the restless *manas* under control. These observations are remarkably coherent, and plainly proceed from *v. 26* directly to *v. 33*.

On these grounds Garbe quite rightly excluded *vv. 27–32*; but he overlooked the fact that, in this interpolation, it is once again not an affair of any violent opposition to *Bhakti*, but precisely of a section of *Bhakti* itself of a type that I shall discuss later on.¹

(4). The Section, *vv. 37–46*, deals with a problem which was undoubtedly a frequent topic in *Yoga* circles. For many persons will never have succeeded in pursuing the extremely toilsome way of *Yoga* to the very end; have their exertions then been altogether in vain? Is it worth while beginning a path whose end one may never be able to reach? Krishna's answer affably resolves this scruple.

(B). The *Bhakti* Section, VI. 47–IX.

With VI. 47 the author begins the presentation of *Bhakti-Mārga* as the *higher fulfilment* of this mere *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga-Mārga*. For the best of all *yogins*—the really perfect *yogin*—is solely he who seeks his salvation in *Bhakti* itself, and endeavours in fact to incorporate this principle, thus far therefore it too might well assert that repose is “dependent” on God. The term *samsthā*, however, means not “dependent on”, but “dwelling in”, which corresponds exactly to the theory of *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*. *Īśvara*, indeed, is as “satisfied” (*āptakāma*) always blessed; in him, therefore, repose ever dwells. But the *yogin* wishes to attain by means of his discipline *the same condition* as the “Supreme Spirit”, and hence to obtain *the same* peace which *also* subsists in God. Thus the expression does not here mean that the *yogin*, like the *bhakta*, gains his peace *in* and *through* God, but that he wins the same peace as dwells in God as in him who is saved from eternity—the *nitya-mukta*. Here too, then, it is not yet a matter of genuinely *Bhakti* doctrine, but only of the preliminary stage of a *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*; cf. p. 292.

¹ cf. p. 214.

therewith in God Himself, not in the *Nirvāna* of the mere *siddha*. Here then there already appear indications of the later developments of *Bhakti* theology, since in this system it has always been incumbent upon the mere *Karvalayayogin* that he should be released from *samsāra*. But this *Samuccaya*¹ attitude has not been invariably adopted, as in this instance, in the sense that the *yogin* was regarded as a natural *candidate* for salvation through *Bhakti*. At a later period, certainly, he was allowed to escape *samsāra*, but at the same time he was not admitted to the highest salvation; rather was he confined in some "corner" outside *samsāra*, but by this very fate he was for ever *excluded* from the highest access to God, since in fact he did not "return".

(B) is subdivided as follows:—

(1). *Knowledge*, VII. 1-14. In this type of *Bhakti* theology, too, everything depends on correct and lofty knowledge of God; and thus The Supreme first of all teaches the speculative theology of *vv. 4-13*. This God too is a Universal Deity and contains the Universe in Himself—that is in His two "Natures", the lower or *jada* as the totality of the unspiritual, and the higher or *jīva*, the sum of the spiritual in the Universe, both alike being specified by the constituents of the three *gunas*. High above these *gunas* stands God Himself, but by the deluded He is not recognized behind the veil of the *gunas*.

(2). *The Knower*, 15-30. The knower attains salvation in God; he who knows not can only serve the *devas* and gain mere earthly gifts. Knowledge, or "release from delusion" (*v. 28*), is attained by good works, and then knowledge imparts the redeeming *Bhakti*.

(3). *Eschatology*.

(a). *Individual Eschatology*, VIII. 5-16. The final goal is the blissful departure to God, and is attained primarily by correct and pious behaviour in the hour of death (*vv. 5-8*).

¹ cf. p. 195.

This is confirmed by the insertion of an *ancient hymn* (in *Upendravajra* strophes) which is briefly annotated (vv. 9-16).

(b). *Cosmic Eschatology*, 17-21.

(c). The Conclusion of (a) and (b) in v. 22.¹

(4). *God's Freedom* from the Law of *Karman*, in spite of His unwearied activity, IX. 7-9.

It seems to me that Garbe connected this Section with VIII. 19 quite unjustifiably. For much more do these verses contain new and independent ideas, on the one hand exhibiting God as One Who is unweariedly active in the play of the Universe, and on the other hand solving the problem which consequently and inevitably arises for Hindu thought—How God, active in this way, can nevertheless be free from the Law of *Karman*.—this being the Indian formulation of the question, which confronts every Theism, as to God's superiority over Necessary Law.

All this spontaneously clears the way for the next Section:—for since God, by virtue of His “*Nature*”, effects all, fools allow themselves to be dazzled by Nature, and do not recognize God behind Nature, which belongs to Him. This Section (4) is followed in due course by (5) (vv. 10-25), which first of all contrasts Faith with the unbelief of those deluded by Nature, and then its lower and perturbed phases with mature and lucid belief.

(5). The Relation of the sole true *Bhakti* religion to the incredulous and the sceptical; the superiority of *Bhakti* and the characteristics of the *bhakta*, IX. 10-25.

(6). Concluding Exposition of the all-embracing *Bhakti*, which makes blessed and destroys sin, IX. 26-34.

I shall now discuss the verses in this Treatise which Garbe placed in brackets.

(1). Chapter VI. 27-32. Here it is evident that v. 33 follows most closely on v. 26, the connection being that after the description of *Yoga* technique as such, the diffi-

¹ On VIII. 23-IX. 6, cf. pp. 222 ff.

culties to be overcome therein were to be described; but *vv. 27-32* intrude upon this clear and firm structure in the most disturbing way. Still further, as we have just seen, it was principally an affair of the presentation of mere *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* which, as *vv. 20, 21*, clearly prove, asserts the goal of salvation to be the simple *siddhatvam*, not the goal in God, which first of all appears explicitly in the *Bhakti* Section beginning with *v. 47*. Whoever has grasped the method of these Treatises, which exhibit throughout a systematic and, if not always very firm, at least a well-ordered structure, must be surprised that the correctness of Garbe's views on these points can ever have remained unrecognized. On the other hand, however, Garbe was mistaken in thinking that this short Section—*vv. 27-32*—is an intrusion of impersonal *Vedānta* mysticism. For in this passage too it is essentially a matter of *Bhakti*, of that type which I have already called *Advaita Bhakti*,¹ when I maintained that *Bhakti* can sympathize wholeheartedly with "mysticism" and can, indeed, harbour within itself a tendency to pass over into mysticism that is, however, essentially different from the "cool" mysticism of abstract impersonal *Advaita*. Rather does it become a *personal* mysticism, with God as its Object, which fills the terms of impersonal mysticism with its own warm emotional content. Thus the Eternal One becomes the God of Grace of *Bhakti*; at the same time, however, this personal mysticism, whose Object is God, also exhibits the aspect of intimate union, of experiencing Him as the Being in Whom antitheses vanish, of seeing God in oneself and oneself in God, and thereby oneself in unity with all things and all things in unity with oneself. In this Section therefore (*vv. 27-32*) we find the mysticism of the *Īśa Upanishad* and the *Vishnu Purāna*, with its wholly personal implications. Further—although Garbe failed to observe this too—owing to its

¹ *cf.* p. 166.

personal *Bhakti* mysticism the brief passage *vv. 27-32* is very sharply contrasted with impersonal *Advaita* mysticism, and expresses this profound difference bluntly and openly, and with a polemical purpose, in *v. 30*. For the essential characteristic of impersonal *Advaita* mysticism is, in fact, that in it the "triad", or the contrast between the knower, the object known and the process of knowing, and at the same moment the antithesis between God and man, must *vanish*; and this reproach is indeed repeatedly levied against it, from the standpoint of personal religion, even in India itself, since it implies that the individual person is "lost", while God is likewise "lost" to man, both being reciprocally lost to one another. And the most explicit protest against this essentially impersonal *Advaita* is to be found in *vi. 30*, although it is at the same moment the tenderest in the entire *Gītā*:—

“* Whoso sees Me in all things, and sees all things in Me,
I am not *lost* to him, nor is he *lost* to Me.

These words, simple though they are, express the protest against the ancient mysticism of the *Upanishads*, in its true form, much more vigorously than do all Rāmānuja's arguments in opposition to Śankara, and in them genuine *Bhakti* employs its own most impressive terms. Certainly it is a type of *Bhakti* which, owing to its specific emotional attitude, even though this has a quite different aspect, has led to the experience of the profound unity of all things in One Who is, however, a *personal* and not an *impersonal* One. It is in truth the mysticism of Tersteegen—that form into which finally even Eckhardt's rugged *Advaita* repeatedly passes, and which subsequently finds its popular expression in the *Bhāgavata* and *Vishnu Purāna*. Occasionally, again, it lives even in the songs of the *ālvārs*, the precursors of the severely personalistic Yāmunamuni and his disciple Rāmānuja.

(2). Chapter VII. 14, 15. Garbe excluded these verses because the term *Māyā* occurs in them. But this seems to me to be incorrect, and on this point I may refer to my remarks on the characteristic ambiguity of *Māyā* in *Mysticism East and West*, pp. 95 *ff.* Garbe translated the term by “the Universe that appears” or “the apparent Universe”. With this, however, it is not concerned, since it actually implies God’s creative and universal activity, through which this Universe with its *gunas*, that is to say its three World constituents, exists.¹ But at the same time this creative activity and all its results, even according to the doctrine of *Bhakti* theologians, constitute an absolute *Self-concealment* of God *behind* His work—a *tirodhāna* or obscuring of the Creator by and through His creation; and the inevitable consequence of this is that man turns towards the World and its objects and concerns, instead of directing his spirit towards the Creator. To this extent, then, the possibility of this deviation from God lies actually in the Creator Himself; so far, therefore, He is really the great “deceiver” and His *Māyā* an “illusion”, since He Himself produces the Universe and those very sense objects which take the human spirit captive and divert it from Him. But on the other hand, and with respect to exhortation and admonition, the true cause of this proneness to self-deception lies in that “desire” for the things of sense which actually leads man away from God or, as *v. 15* immediately adds, in their “diabolical nature”. According to their real meaning, therefore, both verses rightly pertain to the soteriological context in with they stand here, and should under no conditions be omitted.

(3). But as regards VII. 8–11, the case is quite different. These are certainly not Non-duality doctrine (*Advaitavāda*) in any technical sense, since they are associated with a specific idea of God which has no connection whatever

¹ *cf.* p. 118.

with either *Advaita* or *Dvaita*, and springs from a wholly different source. Here God is conceived not so much as *unum in omnibus*, but rather as *optimum in omnibus*; and this has an essentially different meaning and arises from quite different ideas. They fall into line, in fact, with the other lengthy and important interpolation in x. 12-42, with which I shall deal later on in Treatise VIII. But for this very reason they did not originally form part of the present Treatise, which has no interest whatever in all this, while (still further) their hymn style is completely different from the easily recognizable prosaic style of the author with whom I am here concerned. For since he was most definitely a Theist, intent on rejecting all confusion between God and His creatures, he was compelled *immediately* to add to his assertion that all beings originate from the two "Natures" of God, and therefore from Himself, so that God is Himself the origin and the end of the Universe, the obviously restrictive assurance of *v. 12* (which controverts the independence assigned to *Prakriti* in *Sāṅkhya*) that everything constituted by the three *gunas* is in truth no self-dependent essence, independent of God, but likewise springs from Him alone: it does not include and comprehend Him, but, on the contrary, He as the superior Being contains and comprehends it. Verse 7, however, should *not* be bracketed, since it simply summarizes the principle (just enunciated) that all things are changing forms of God's own "Nature"; He, in truth, by virtue of His "Nature" is the thread that sustains and connects all that is:—"In so far, that is, as I, with My two Natures, pervade all things as the sustaining ground of their being" (*v. 7b*). I differ from Garbe here, therefore, and regard this verse as necessarily pertaining to the *Text*. It asserts that there is no higher primal principle than the personal *Īśvara* Himself, Who effects everything and (in virtue of His two "Natures") is everything. There is, for example, no ostensible imper-

sonal *Aksharam Brahma*, subsisting as higher than even He.

(4). What has just been said, still further, applies to vii. 25, 26, since here likewise there is no reference to "the Universe that appears". *Yoga-Māyā* means creative power by means of *Yoga*, that is to say the *Yoga* of the great *Yogin* and *Māyin*, or in other words of God. *Yoga* therefore, which originally meant magical power, is in this passage, as in several others, simply God's miraculous Power which authenticates itself in His *Māyā*—in His fashioning of the Universe.¹ According to Śrīdhara, *Yoga* is the bringing into activity of an incomprehensible (supernatural, and originally magical) knowledge; this *Yoga* is precisely *Māyā*, or in other words, "the capacity actually to realize the impossible". God creates by means of both, while through His creation God is *samchanna*—"masked". In the same way, as I have already observed, Luther regarded "Nature" as *larva Dei*.

(5). I feel inclined, too, to defend vii. 29, 30, as against Garbe's comments. They run:—"They who strive for release from old age and death, in simple trust in Me, know by its means *Brahman* complete as present in the self, and all action. They who know Me as present in beings, as present in the gods, and as present in the sacrifice, and also at the time of their departure, which alone is true knowledge, with trained minds". Thus Śrīdhara correctly explains the sense of these verses:—"They who worship Me in this manner know all that it is necessary to know, and have reached the goal". Their aim, therefore, is not to elucidate learned issues, but to say that "He who, in need of salvation, takes refuge in Me and strives onwards along the path of virtue already indicated, has what the wisest theologian has (or has not)". In that case, however, v. 30 means not that "He who in the hour of death has the correct theology about Me, knowing how to define Me in terms such as

¹ cf. p. 117.

Adhibhūta, Adhidaiva, Adhiyajña", but on the contrary: "He who knows that precisely all the highest and deepest things are I, the God Who can be attained by worship and virtuous conduct, *he* really knows Me—not he who speculates about these matters". This interpretation is fully sustained in VIII. 5, while VIII. 1-4 form a clumsy marginal Gloss which, in failing to grasp the proper standpoint accurately, regarded it as necessary to explain the terms of lofty scholastic speculation that are quoted simply *by way of example*, but against which the practical and edifying viewpoint of the Treatise is definitely directed. It is, in fact, just as though one were to say to a simple believer in Christ, who is troubled because he understands nothing of advanced dogmatic theology:—"He who, until his last moments, relies on the blood and righteousness of Christ, understands the entire Trinity and the two Natures better than all the doctors". *Bhakti* doctrine, then, is doctrine for the plain man, and the true sense of the two verses 29, 30, is to express this principle. In *v. 29a*, therefore, the author purposely chooses, for his description of the bliss of salvation, not such sublime expressions as *Nirvāna, Brahma-Nirvāna, Siddhi* or *Samsiddhi*, but rather the primitive old phrase:—"He who wishes to be free from age and death", just as we should say quite simply "He who would go to Heaven"; *v. 29b*, again, is not concerned with elevated scholarship but with simple trust in God, and whoever has this is the genuine scholar and the one who has truly "the trained mind". He cites a host of lofty theological terms, therefore, not at all because he thinks them important or seeks to explain them, but merely in order to say that "He who has till death the plain and comforting faith 'Vāsudeva is all in all' needs nothing more". *Brahma tat* is a slightly mocking expression which has been the subject of much scholastic speculation, while here, presumably, *Adhyātmam* is intended for "the doctrine of the *Adhyātman*" as subtle

speculation about the *ātman*, and “all *Karman*” is the philosophic system (*mīmāṃsā*) of Vedic ritual action with its subtleties and sophistry; *Adhidīvam* approximates to *divinum essentiale* and *Adhibhūtam* is *ens entium*; *Adhiyajñam* is either “what refers to the sacrifice” or “the actual sacrifice”, and depends on whether the *Brahman* theologian explained *Brahman* itself as the sacrifice, or the *jñānayajña* as the real offering, or perhaps the *Adhiyajñas*—the Highest God—as the receiver of all offerings.

All this is quite the reverse of what Garbe appears to have assumed. For here, in fact, it is not a utilization of *Īśvara* for the impersonal *Brahman* that is indicated so much as the claim that whoever strives for the goal, while *trusting in* *Īśvara*, thereby knows all, and more indeed than the learned *Veda* scholar or the speculator on the mysteries of magical sacrificial power, and more too than he who knows “action”, which in this context means the complicated acts of ritual. What is intended is:—“Precisely those who simply trust in *Īśvara* are the true ‘spiritually disciplined’ knowers”; and this is the genuine and typical *Bhakti* attitude. At the same time the words, “at the time of their departure”, clearly prepare the way for the succeeding Section on Eschatology in VIII. 5 *ff.* There can be no doubt then (to repeat) that VIII. 1-4 constitute a pretentious Gloss which completely misunderstands the quite simple significance of VII. 29, 30; and it is in any case quite evident that the words “who in the last hour” (VIII. 5) are most closely connected with VII. 30, and express more fully and directly the tendency manifest in *vv.* 29, 30. The writer of this Gloss, having failed to understand the purport of VII. 29, 30, exerts himself in order to interpret the extremely obscure vocables previously referred to which were, however, not at all in question. No doubt he first of all wrote his own construction in the margin of the MS, whence it subse-

quently invaded the *Text*. But with this latter they have nothing whatever to do, and the writer of the Treatise does not trouble himself about them at all, but in VIII. 5 continues imperturbably the course of his clear exposition, and quite evidently with direct reference to VII. 30.

(6). I believe too that Garbe was mistaken in bracketing VIII. 20-22. As with every theology, the purpose of the preceding Section was to discuss Eschatology; and the *eschaton* of the Universe, which is at the same time the beginning of its creation anew, was the submergence of all (unredeemed) beings into the undeveloped and unmanifested (*Avyaktam*), or in terms of later *Bhakti* theology, the return to the subtle condition which, in being imperceptible by the senses, is in fact such an *Avyaktam*. It became therefore *imperatively necessary* to assert most positively that above this cosmic *Avyaktam* there existed yet another, the supercosmic, subsequently called the *Suddha-sattvam*.¹ This is a *bhāva*, or state of being, which is similarly *imperceptible* to the ordinary mind, and into which those enter who are freed from the world and redeemed, who do not succumb to simplification into the *inferior Avyaktam* of the rest of the Universe but are eternally exempted from this, together with those released from eternity (the *nityas*). Apart from such a restriction the earlier statement in v. 18 would have been most seriously misleading, so that it *necessarily pertains to the Eschatology*. This *bhāva*, as a supermundane condition, is in fact the "supreme abode" of which all *Bhakti* theology speaks, symbolizing it mythologically as *Vaikuntha* (the highest Heaven); and in v. 11 Krishna had expressly promised to speak about such a "supreme abode". Thus v. 22 forms an excellent conclusion to all that precedes by definitely asserting that, in going to the supreme abode where one will meet *Íśvara* and receive existential attributes identical with His own², one can

¹ cf. p. 73, Note 2.

² cf. pp. 127, 180.

attain to the Supreme God only through *Bhakti*; all the emphasis falls on *bhaktyā*—on devotion.

(7). As regards VIII. 23–28, however, there is certainly room for doubt. For this ancient mythical Eschatology of the two ways is as foreign as is possible to the spirit of later doctrines of redemption, as it is too to *Bhakti* teaching; but it is at the same time an old constituent of the tradition with which the theologians had to deal. In *v.* 27, in fact, an evident attempt is made to dispense with it as far as possible, since it asserts that the believer should not allow himself to be confused by these two ways; and this most probably means that he need not concern himself about them.

(8). Chapter IX. 1–6, is an independent interpolation from a different source than that of VIII. 23–28, as is proved by the solemn introductory verse, IX. 1, which inaugurates a wholly fresh start. Its insertion proves that it is intended to assert something of quite peculiar importance, although it might at first be taken, especially by a superficial reader, to be a mere repetition (*anuvāda*) of the earlier statements in VII. 1–12; and in fact its *v.* 4.—“in Me abide all beings, but I endure not in them”—is an almost literal quotation from VII. 12. On the other hand this repetition, and especially the declaration in *v.* 4, provide the key to the problem of its insertion. For the intense other-worldliness, and also the distinction between God and the Universe, which the author of Treatise VI maintains, thereby approximating closely to a dualistic (*Dvaita*) point of view, is now meant to be *surpassed* by a representative of this latter tendency. With this in mind, therefore, he first of all solemnly repeats in *v.* 4 the doctrine which had already been expounded and then, in *v.* 5, he proceeds still further in the direction of a *Dvaita* of God and the Universe:—“Strictly speaking, we may not say even that ‘things abide in Me’, which would in any case imply an extremely intimate existential relation

between God and the Universe. But the correct interpretation is that things are the *pure product of transcendent, miraculous, creative Power*.

"God 'causes to be', that is to say, He *creates*, purely and simply. This creation is, then, no longer an emanation of things from Himself. Rather does God transcend them to such a degree that He no longer even dwells in them, nor they in Him."

All this means that, for this theologian, even the idea of the immanence of God in objects becomes questionable; so he concludes with *v. 6*, the meaning of which is quite clear:—"If we wish to retain the old saying that things exist in God—and how can we wholly eliminate so weighty a tradition?—then *at the most* we can regard things as existing in God in the same sense that the air exists in space. Doubtless it exists in space, but it does not consist of space, and has nothing essentially in common with it."

This Section is of great interest in showing how early the tendency set in, in some *Bhakti* circles, which because of God's transcendence could not remain satisfied with even the qualified Monism of a *Viśiṣṭādvaita*, but transferred its allegiance to the fully developed *Dvaita* which, in fact, subsequently became formulated as logical and detailed systematic doctrine by Madhva, the great *ācārya* (teacher).

The interpolator of IX. 1-6 was well aware of the importance of his own particular standpoint. His cumulative expressions—*jñānam vijñānasahitam, guhyatamam*, "most secret knowledge and understanding"—on which redemption itself depends, together with *rājavidyā, rājaguhyam, pavidram uttamam, yogam aiśvaram* ("royal knowledge," etc.), far transcend the assurances in the other Treatise that they impart ultimate knowledge, while the polemical exclusiveness, which subsequently characterized the controversial exponents of Duality (*dvaitavādins*), is already visible in *v. 3*. To him all other doctrines appear impious because it

is his alone that actually exalts God above all worldly Being; and only through the absolute divorce of the Universe from God does it become truly subordinated to Him. Solely in his own doctrine is the *Aiśvaryam* of God—His “being the Lord”—fully assured; and in this he comes nearest of all Hindu theologians to the Occidental idea of God’s creativeness. For even in the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* system creation always remains “an emanation from Himself”; the Universe is therefore a fragment and an alteration (*vikāra*) of God Himself, while He is the substratum within the objects emanating from Him.¹ Here, however, it runs:—“I am He Who *causes beings to exist*, without I Myself (in substance) existing in them”; which means that “they exist through Me and by Me, but not out of Me; and My *Yoga Aiśvara* (My Power as Lord) consists in My Power not merely ‘to emit’ from what already exists, but by virtue of supernatural and miraculous Power to call into being what has not yet existed”. As contrasted with Indian tradition, which was in principle emanationist, any such conception was indeed a veritable “secret”, “most secret” (*guhyam* and *guhyatamam*):—terms which are in this context much more than rhetorical pretentiousness, since they confirm the conviction of actually saying something that is not generally known, but is concealed from the great majority. It is undeniable, therefore, that the ultimate impelling motive in the emergence of dualistic doctrine (*Dvaitavāda*) was no mere speculation, but precisely this profound numinous emotion which finds its deepest expression in the idea of God as absolutely transcending the Universe, and Who, because of His “being the Lord”, must be *separated* from all worldly Being and opposed to it as the “Wholly Other”. These principles are indeed preluded in those *Viśiṣṭādvaita* passages which emphasize the Lord God’s being elevated far above His own *Prakṛiti*, which He guides by His own free Will. Neverthe-

¹ *cf.* vii. 7.

less they enjoy full liberty of expression for the first time in this typical specimen of *Yoga Aśvara* and in the contrast of *v. 4*, never previously sustained, between *Bhūta-Bhāvana* and *na bhūtastha*; and to this is due the outstanding significance of the present interpolation for the History of Religion.

Once this feature of the Section has been recognized, the temptation arises to conjecture, in the words *rājavidyā* and *rājaguhyam*, a meaning specifically determined by the context. Usually they would both be translated by “royal knowledge” and “royal secret”, in the sense of “the highest knowledge” and “the most significant secret”, just as *Rāja-Yoga* means simply “the king among *Yoga* forms”, or “the best *Yoga*”. On the other hand *rāja-dharma*, for example, means not “the king of all the *dharma*s”, but the *dharma* which concerns the king. It may be, accordingly, that the two terms *rājavidyā* and *rājaguhyam* here also mean “the knowledge of Me as being the King”, and “My royal” or “My majestic secret”, which would very well agree with the later expression in *v. 5*：“know My Power is their LORD”. In other words:—“Behold My Power as that of the LORD, superior to the Universe, Who can call beings into existence without being Himself compelled to surrender to them the substance of existence, simply because He can actually ‘create’”, God’s royal secret would then mean the secret which others do not know—that He is actually *King* of the Universe. For King He is in the fullest possible sense, and no mere World-ground, when He Himself is not the Universe nor the Universe He, but rather when He is absolutely the transcendently creative.

As to the method adopted, there can once again be discerned in this interpolation the intention to give the reader, *in advance*, the “correct” viewpoint from which to consider the next Section of the *Text*: whoever has read *vv. 1-6* is strongly inclined to interpret what follows in their light.

Treatise VI itself, however, by no means advances as far as does this interpolation; rather is the tendency, which subsequently culminated in *Viśiṣṭādvaita*, first breaking ground in it, almost all the basal elements involved being either already present here or prepared for. Both the psychical and the material worlds are God's "Natures", which pass through the unceasing process of evolution and involution; and to this corresponds Rāmānuja's doctrine about the *Deha* of God in His being both Cause and Effect:—as *Kāranam* and *Kāryam*. Beyond this process, still further, the higher *bhāva* appears at this stage as the essential attribute of being redeemed, and as such transcending the movement of the worlds and untouched by it. Thus the relation to the Vedic-Brahmanic tradition is decidedly positive, while as a matter of course the Treatise purports to rest on a Vedic basis, exalted knowledge of God being emphasized and speculatively and methodically developed. It may be assumed that the theories of a Bodhāyana probably resembled those of this Treatise and that Yāmunamuni subsequently developed them fully in his *Siddhitraya*, while his disciple Rāmānuja perpetuated them in his *Bhāshya* or, in other words, in the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* doctrine itself. Garbe was therefore unquestionably wrong in bracketing VII. 19:—"Vāsudeva is all"—since this confession is wholly identical with that of the *Viśiṣṭādvaita Bhakti* theologians; and had he been asked, the author of the present Treatise would undeniably, and as a matter of course, have admitted that he was an *advaitin*. At the same time the specific sense which the phrase "Vāsudeva is all" assumes in the mouth of a *viśiṣṭādvaitin* must also be considered:—not here as being the expression of any profound feeling on the part of the believer somewhat in the form: "therefore I am God", but as the confession of God's absolute imperishable Majesty and Lordship (*Māhātmyam* and *Aiśvaryam*); and this includes (on the one hand) humility and (on the other) trust. It

asserts that God is *All*, while I and everything else whatsoever are consequently nothing more than His *śesha*—His “residue”—nothing but what is placed here by Him, from Him receiving existence but having *no* existence of and from itself. On the other hand, because He is everything it is also He Who effects everything, while all comes from His Hand, into which whoever confesses that “Vāsudeva is all” trustfully resigns himself. He was therefore a poet of personal *Bhakti* who later sang:—

He, the Sublime, is the Being Who fills all things,
And filled by Him is all that moves on Earth.
They are all the body and the throne of Vāsudeva.

Again:—

He Who has coloured the white swans and gaily adorned
the parrots,
Given to the peacocks their many-hued splendour, will
surely provide for me.

And all this is included in the words:—“Vāsudeva is all”.

TREATISE VII: THE *GIĀ*, II. 39-IV. 42. *Buddhi-Yoga*,
connected with the Worship of Krishna as the *Īśvara-guru* (*Guru-Bhakti*).

This Treatise, which reaches its obvious culmination in the words of its last verse (IV. 42: “Stand up, O Bhārata”) approximates very closely to the First Part of *The Original Gītā*, into which *Sāṅkhya* elements have been interpolated. Its intention is to advance *Yoga* doctrines, as distinguished from the *Sāṅkhya* which ostensibly preceded in II. 11-38. Actually, however, it is itself permeated with *Sāṅkhya* ideas, while all the specific elements of *technical Yoga* are absent. It provides therefore no directions whatever regarding the technique of *Yoga*, and the atmosphere of the entire Section is as far removed from the lofty and ecstatic experiences of

the infinite happiness (*sukham ātyantam*) of technical *Yoga* as it is from those of emotional *Bhakti*. The mood is cool and rational, and its problem is not the violent tearing apart of the soul from the body and its binding forces, which pertains to *Yoga*, but rather the attainment of inner equanimity. Nevertheless Oldenberg was right in maintaining that a small *Yoga* manual has been interpolated here. For it expounds a *Yoga* in the *extended* and more general sense of constantly practised and voluntary inner concentration of *buddhi*, as contrasted with the agitations due to the senses and the fetters imposed by sense objects; it is, in truth, *Buddhi-Yoga*, which may be termed Character-*Yoga* in order to distinguish it from technical *Yoga*, and finds its parallels in Stoicism.¹ It too regards intense will power in the face of emotions, *passiones*, and of sensuous excitements, as pertaining to fever (*jvara*); while at the same time its ideal is the “constancy” of *buddhi* as power of insight, but still more as “force of *resolution*”. The steadfast resolve to hold one’s ground collectedly and firmly against the inducements of the senses is founded in purified “insight” or “knowledge”—that of the proper relation between the self and the sensuous attractions of the senses (*indriyas*), of being fettered by the latter and of liberation into the “*Brahman* condition” of complete tranquillity (*samatā*). At the same time, however, it is a *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, and recognizes the Lord, but on the other hand contains not one single word about redemption through *Bhakti*. It inculcates devotion to Krishna, and finds occasion to expound the doctrine of His *avatāra*. But for it, and again in conformity with *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, Krishna the God is essentially the ancient *guru*, who in days of yore taught this *Buddhi-Yoga*, and who comes to Earth not so much to save by kindling the redeeming *Bhakti*, but rather to restore righteousness (*dharma*) anew as soon as this falls into decay. The term

¹ cf. p. 128.

Bhakti is absent, and only once, in iv. 9, is the goal of salvation, as mere *naishkarmyam* or freedom from *Karman*, enhanced by departure to Krishna.¹ The author is simultaneously a *sāṅkhyā* and a *yogin*, and has impregnated Krishna's original words with *Sāṅkhyā* ideas.

In its First Part this Treatise provides evidence that there must have been a *Yoga* tendency which required, for the attainment of *śānti*, scarcely—or indeed not at all—the technical *Karman* of *Yoga* discipline, but aspired to inner *samatā* simply by schooling the self towards freedom from “attachment” to accomplishing works; at the same time, however, it regarded this as *Brahma-Bhāva*.

Its construction throughout is well ordered and quite clear:—

Buddhi-Yoga, connected with the Worship of Krishna as the *Īśvara-guru*.

(A). *Yoga as Buddhi-Yoga*:

(i). Praise of the Equanimity-*Yoga* and its advantages over Vedism; *Yoga* action is calm and disinterested. Censure of Vedic eudemonistic conduct; contrasted with this is the wise man, who indeed acts, but with no interest in reward, *vv.* 39-47.

(ii). It is therefore a matter of acting, but with serene equanimity, which is more important than any action. *Buddhi-Yoga* as the practice of depth of insight and force of resolution; this is superior to any consideration for religious traditions, 48-53.

(iii). It is identical with *prajñā*, with *samādhi* and with *dhī*,² and consists in having no wishes, in self-composure, in

¹ This does not transgress beyond the frame of a normal *Guru-Bhakti*, similarly God's activities, in iv. 10-13, do not go beyond those of the “Great Spirit” (*pradhāna-ātman*) in *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, cf. p. 127. The whole passage is an attempt to give the Krishna cult a basis by making Him a God-*guru*, who was indeed recognized by mere *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* also.

² *sapientia*, rapture and meditation; cf. p. 46.

freedom from passions such as grief or joy, from desires and mental agitation, in indifference to sense objects, 54-59.

(iv). The contest between the senses and *buddhi*; the genesis of desires and passions, and of the loss of *buddhi*, 60, 61.

(v). The peace of soul of the *buddhi* adept and the attainment of its permanence. The difference between the wise man and the fool. This condition of *sānti* is the “*Brahma state*” and leads to the future goal, 62-72.

(vi). *Buddhi* and Action. If *buddhi* with its inner composure is in itself the Highest, and more than all action, what then is the use of action? III. 1, 2.

(a). In any case mere omission of action is not in itself the way to *naishkarmyam*—to freedom from *Karman*, 3, 4.

(b). Action is a necessity of Nature which no one can avoid, 5.

(c). In the supposed omission of action (by saints of the penitential type) there is usually hypocrisy, 6.

(d). Accomplish therefore the “action that is necessary”, 8-19 (omitting 9-18). The reasons for this are:—

(1). The example of Janaka, and regard for the maintenance of order which would be disturbed by flight from the world, 20, 21.

(2). God too cultivates this regard, while the wise man takes this as an example, 22-26.

(3). *Sāṅkhya* insight, according to which the wise man conducts himself, 27-29.

(4). Action cannot harm if one casts it upon God, Who prevents its evil consequences, 30-32. (Verses 33-35 are marginal Glosses, unconnected with what precedes, and self-contained.)

(vii). The problem of Evil; 36-43.

(B). The Connection of *Buddhi-Yoga* with the Worship of *Krishna* as the divine original *Guru*; its incorporation as *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*.

(viii). Although *Buddhi-Yoga* has been forgotten, it still has the highest authority, since Krishna Himself taught it in primitive times, and Krishna is God, iv. 1-6.

(ix). (a). The purpose of His *avatāra*, 7-10.

(b). Although God is unweariedly active, partly in fulfilling man's wishes (11, 12), partly in creating and sustaining the Universe of the three *gunas* (13), still He effects for Himself no *Karman*, since in this His activity He does not aim at the fruit of reward for Himself. Whoever recognizes God in this way (and acts as He does), likewise attains freedom from *Karman* (14, 15).

(C). (x). Genuine Activity and Non-activity, 16, 17.

(a). To preserve inner composure in action, and to be free from attachment, is true non-activity. On the other hand, to be able to effect something while preserving inner composure is true activity, 18-22.

(xi). (b). The fatal consequences of all action are annulled by freedom from attachment and by "knowledge"¹ which possesses the magical power of *yajña* (sacrifice) and by means of this burns away all action, 23, 33, 34, 36-42a.

Finally, the concluding phrase *v. 42b*, "Stand up, O Bhārata", clumsily enough links up this Treatise, which itself is completely alien to Arjuna's situation, with the original *Text* of *The Gītā*. For "completely alien" it is, since Arjuna's *śoka* includes no enquiry about the general relations between activity and non-activity, nor did any such theological subtleties ever trouble him in his *vishāda*. Not whether "activity" binds, then, but the quite concrete anxiety as to whether one may ever destroy worthy masters, and disregard sacred bonds of relationship, had aroused his *vishāda*.

IV. 23, is usually translated:—"bring his action as a sacrifice", which is also the interpretation given by the long-winded Brahmanic Gloss, *vv. 24-32*.² But this is altogether

¹ Thus through a combination of *Buddhi-Yoga* and *Sāṅkhya*.

² cf. Chapter VIII, p. 286. *

opposed to the meaning of the writer of the Treatise, who does not refer here to "bringing action as a sacrifice", but intends to discuss the *jñāna-yajña* in familiar fashion, as *v.* 33 clearly proves. Thus again *v.* 23:—"He who is free from attachment, who has established his mind in knowledge, while he employs" the knowledge "in *yajña*, all his action is annihilated". As *v.* 33 shows, therefore, there is absolutely no question here of "bringing one's action as a sacrifice". For not the work, but knowledge, is *yajña*. Knowledge, however, as in *vv.* 36-38, is regarded as a mighty, magical *pavitram* (ceremony of purification), as one means of atonement, which is capable of dissolving the fatality of the fettering *Karma* like a caustic alkali and consuming it like fire. This idea closely follows the course of the ancient notion of the *magical power* of *jñāna*; and in that case *v.* 23 becomes self-explanatory. The *jñāna* must be applied to the *yajña*; and then *yajña* is in no sense whatever conceived as a *gift* to the *Deity*, but in its magical sense as a *self-acting* or automatic ceremony (*pavitram*) and as a rich store of energy.¹ Thus the series of verses—23, 33, 34, 36-38—exhibits the clearest and most direct interconnection; they are firmly and compactly united together, being interrupted in the crudest possible way by the *Brāhmaṇa*-like disquisition of 24-32, which actually has nothing whatever to do with the matter; and the intention of the interpolator is quite bluntly expressed in *v.* 32, in which he advances a speculative theory of sacrifice, and then declares that whoever possesses *this*, together with the knowledge *about it*, will be redeemed. This is in the sound old *Brahman* tradition, but it is nevertheless absolutely opposed to what the author of the present Treatise maintains and asserts. Not Vedic knowledge about sacrifices, which he unreservedly rejects and ridicules, but knowledge about action in repose, and repose in action

¹ For *yajñāya ācaratas* there might quite well be substituted *pavitrāya ācaratas*.

combined with the knowledge of *Sāṅkhya*, is for him the redeeming *pavitra*m. Here then, if anywhere, we discern the efforts of the ancient theologians of sacrifice to substantiate their own beliefs within *The Gītā* itself; and nothing is so foreign to the thoroughly rational style of the writer of this Treatise as are the subtleties and secret mongering of vv. 24-32; these, together with v. 35, must therefore unquestionably be rejected.¹

Garbe's ascription of vv. 25-30 to the actual writer of this Treatise, then, is indefensible, while on the other hand his exclusion of v. 34 is without justification, since it is obvious that in the concluding Section (C) the author once again intends to combine *Sāṅkhya* ideas with those of *Yoga*; he is, in fact, a *sāṅkhya* and a *yogin* simultaneously, as I have already observed. The admonition in v. 34, however, is in complete accord with *Sāṅkhya*, and the *jñānins* and *tattvavidas*—those who know the *tattvas*—in this verse are precisely the adepts in *Sāṅkhya* philosophy.

In conclusion, then, it is beyond dispute that the author of the present Treatise is identical with the writer who, in the preceding portion of *The Original Gītā*, interpolated in II. 14-19, 21 and 23-28 the same *Sāṅkhya* ideas which he, being (to repeat) at the same moment a *sāṅkhya* and a *yogin*, expounds here in III. 27-29. In this way he appropriates the first Section of *The Original Gītā*, so that in this respect we may say that Treatise VII extends from II. 14 to its obvious conclusion in IV. 42.

TREATISE VIII: THE *GĪTĀ*, X. 12-42.

In ix. 34, Treatise VI had sounded its unmistakable *Amen*. There, in the guise of Arjuna's speech, it had been announced to everyone who has "entered this impermanent sorrowful world" that this proclamation shows the way to salvation.

¹ cf. further, p. 286.

I have already maintained that Chapter X, 1-8 is part of *The Original Gītā* itself,¹ since it constitutes the indispensable Introduction to the great revelation in XI which was, however, manifested not universally to all who desire salvation, but only to Arjuna with his specific *durgāni* and the misery of his *vishāda*. I have also asserted that x. 9-11 is in no way concerned with his *durgāni*, but is on the contrary an interpolation of generalized and sublime *Bhakti* doctrine.²

This brief Section is now succeeded by x. 12-42, preceding the depiction of the Theophany; it too contains no reference whatever to Arjuna, nor to any soteriological doctrines. It is, on the contrary, a glorification which might have been composed for any of the higher gods, and which is here adapted to Krishna by one of his worshippers. The consciousness of God which underlies and sustains it must be traced back to a special type of religious experience, finding its expression in the *Kaushītaki Upanishad* 4.³ The distinctive features of this Section of this *Upanishad*, however, must not be confused with the magnificent vision of unity of *Brahman-Ātman* mysticism, nor again with the current doctrine that God is identical with everything or that He pervades the Universe; with all such beliefs, in fact, this is definitely at variance. The enquiry certainly concerns *Brahman*; but here *Brahman* means simply the very highest object of worship, the supreme and actual *numen*. The cardinal issue, therefore, is not so much that behind the plurality of the Universe as such, but rather behind the plurality of everything which, in the objects of man's environment, stimulates his numinous feeling and urges him to worship, there is discovered what is unitary, One, and absolutely worthy of worship; or in other terms, that behind all *numina* the Absolute *numen* is found while

¹ Pp. 136 f., 139, 158

² On *durgāni*, cf. p. 142.

³ Deussen's Translation, p. 52.

on the other hand, everything else which arouses the awareness of the numinous is conceived as being the radiation and hypostasis (*vibhūti*) of this One, Absolute *Numen*.¹ “Spirits”, or various kinds of *numina*, are seen “sitting” in objects which excite numinous apperception in sun and moon, in lightning and howling storm, in fire and flood, but more especially too in such disconcerting phenomena as reflections from polished surfaces, the shadow ever accompanying man, puzzling repetitions of the echo, dream content, the *homunculus* visible in the eye, the body with its strange vital functions. Bālāki, for example, cites all these as *Brahman*—as objects of worship—and thus, in fact, he depicts the genuine phantasms of those primary impulses of the numinous consciousness which characterize all primitive religions. But Ajātaśatru, the *kshatriya*, is wiser than the brahman, since he knows the sole, and the highest, of all “spirits”, from Whom those minor spirits all originate and by Whom they are created: they are but His manifestations. This idea implies, in the first place, that God is the *numen* in all numinous things; but gradually it changes, so that from it there is evolved the notion that God is the *optimum* in the various classes of objects, as for example in *The Gītā*, x. 12 ff. Here the different subdivisions of objects are enumerated, and in each God is perennially the Highest and the Best. As the last verse expresses this:—“Every thing that is powerful, beautiful or potent, know that as having originated from one single portion of My Power”. This idea, then, is nothing less than *Advaita*, although it is indubitably stated in terms involving personality. It carries with it no reference whatever to *The Original Gītā*, nor does it accord with any one of the specific doctrines which we have encountered; but what was required was an ancient hymn, associated with this trend of ideas, in praise of Krishna the God; and this explains its reception here.

¹ Cf. x. 18, Note

With this I reach my own conclusion: the impression that *The Original Gītā* exhibits a compact unity must be abandoned; for into its ancient framework a garland of eight Treatises of differing tendency has been incorporated, with the intention of securing for them the authority of Krishna the God. Their characteristic peculiarities, once again, must not be effaced by any search for homogeneity, nor must the utmost degree of mutual adjustment be attempted. On the contrary, the rich multiplicity of Indian experience and thought, which is throughout revealed, must be most scrupulously investigated. Among the *Texts* that have in this way been accumulated some are quite trivial, but others are important and rich in promise; and of them all the greatest is *The Original Gītā* itself with the *Māhātmyam* —the imperishable Majesty—of its Iśvara.

CHAPTER VII

APPENDICES

(I). MANAS AND BUDDHI

Manas: (*mens*: usually Mind): this means both Thinking and The Power of Thought and also, occasionally, man's spiritual Being as contrasted with his corporeality. On the other hand, it should often be translated by "mental tendency" or "disposition", since it may indicate the general inner aspirations of humanity, and sometimes correspond to heart or soul or spirit, even though "heart", if taken at all literally, is too "cordial" and spirit and soul too "soulful". In strict technicality, however, *manas* is on the one hand the antithesis of the *indriyas*, which I have rendered by "senses"; but "capacity" or "faculty" would be still more correct as signifying both the five "capacities" of sense *perception* together with the five *active* "faculties" that are distinguished from these by Hindu Psychology. Still further, *manas* is differentiated from *buddhi*, which in its general sense means knowledge and the "faculty" of knowledge, while often enough it is, in a non-technical sense, a synonym for *manas* itself. In its more properly technical aspects, again, *manas* is what is frequently called "inner sense", or in other terms the capacity to perceive our own psychical states; as such, then, it becomes a "sixth sense", in addition to the five faculties for sense perception; and yet further, the power of interrelating and combining sense perceptions and of discriminating those which constitute apperception. But at this stage *manas* transfers its own content to *buddhi*, so that this alone is the highest level of intellect which at one and the same moment *judges* and induces *resolution*. Simultaneously with this, *buddhi* is

itself the capacity for weal and woe, and hence our *vis aestimativa*—the axiological “faculty” or “capacity for value”. This distinction between *manas* and *buddhi*, again, bears a distant resemblance to that of Kant between *Verstand* and *Vernunft*, or to Coleridge’s differentiation of Understanding from Reason—and hence the use of these two terms as equivalents for the German. But it is still more important that *buddhi*, as the capacity for feeling and the power of resolution, decidedly approximates to the significance of “disposition”, intention or sentiment. Thus *acalā buddhiḥ* is the *mood* of imperturbable equanimity, while *Buddhi-Yoga* can scarcely be rendered otherwise than by “discipline in moods” or in dispositions.

Another term—*cittam*—has almost the same meaning as *manas*; but here the difference probably is that *manas* means rather the organ of thinking, while *cittam* is predominantly the content of thought.

To be distinguished, still further, from the senses, understanding and reason is the *jñāna* of the *ātman* itself. Together with the body, the former pertain to the sphere of *jada*—of the dull or apathetic, the heavy or stifling. Their products, that is to say, in and of themselves, are not knowledge; they only become knowledge because they exist for the *ātman*, while this “illuminates” them with its *jñāna*, which itself is regarded as a radiant light.

Throughout *The Gītā*, however, the use of terms is extremely loose and variable. Sometimes it definitely approximates to technical distinctions, while at others it simply follows ordinary usage with its by no means strict discriminations. It is impossible, therefore, to render words such as *manas* and *buddhi* by the same English equivalents in every passage without exception; and since this is equally true of *Yoga* I have occasionally been compelled to repeat the Sanskrit term itself.

Buddhi-Yoga, to continue, as the strictly methodical

exercise of power of judgment and of resolution, directed to the acquisition of inner constancy and of superiority to the play of mere motives, constitutes *bhāvanā*,¹ the “development” or “cultivation” or “organization” of the inner spiritual being; and thus it approaches the idea of striving after a definitely moulded *character*, so that in this sense we may quite well speak of Character-*Yoga*, that is of a *Yoga* not at all concerned with mystical experiences, but as selecting for its goal precisely this *bhāvanā* itself with its internal or esoteric superiority, its freedom from motives and its independence, together with its resultant *serenitas* of inner peace of the soul.

(II). THE GOD OF *THE GITA*, VĀSUDEVA-VISHNU-NĀRĀYANA, AND HIS ORIGIN

- (1). Narasimha.
- (2). The type of the religion of the *gopas*.
 - (a). The vassals of Krishna.
 - (b). What they regarded as sacred:—*darvatam*.
 - (c). Krishna’s sermon.
 - (d). “Power” as the Mountain-god.
- (3). The idea of Vishnu.
 - (a). Vishnu as pervading “Power”.
 - (b). Vishnu and *Brahman*.
- (4). Vāsudeva.
 - (a). The root *vas*.
- (5). Nārāyana.
 - (a). *nara* and *Nara*.
 - (b). *nārāyana*: its first interpretation.
 - (c). *nārāyana*: its second interpretation. The god of Autumn.
 - (d). The roots of later Krishna-*Bhakti*.
 - (e). Baladeva.

¹ *Iff.* p. 283.

(f). Western Aryan parallels.

(g). The assimilation of the fairy tale of the Far-striding Dwarf.

(h). *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XII. 6, 1

(6). The correction of my Title.

The great World-god Vishnu is at a later stage identified with Nārāyaṇa and with Vāsudeva. From what root has this idea of the god developed? How is Vishnu related to Vāsudeva and to Nārāyaṇa, and how is their identification to be explained?

(1). *Narasimha*

We find Vishnu to be familiar to the Hymn Anthology of the *Vedas*. But it is obvious that here he is a god who made his way in from realms other than the originally Vedic, and was assimilated gradually; as Upa-Īndra¹—as a subordinate Indra—he was admitted with some degree of hesitation, while Nārāyaṇa and Vāsudeva still remain unknown.

One of the oldest passages in which the two latter appear, as quite evidently united with Vishnu, is the great *Litany* of the gods in *Taittirīya Āranyaka*, x. Verse 1, 6, runs:—

“To Nārāyaṇa we bring worship, to Vāsudeva our meditations; and in this may Vishnu assist us”.

Immediately upon this there follows a parallel veneration of the “Diamond Clawed One”, and the “Sharp Toothed”, both of whom here are Narasimha. To this Narasimha, however, a *specific* formula of worship is offered; here, then, he is not yet simply identical with Vishnu. But, quite clearly, he is now regarded as falling within a *class* of gods *similar* to Vishnu-Nārāyaṇa-Vāsudeva—that is as a being who is related and pertains to them, since it is plain that the entire *Litany* groups the individual gods’ names together from the viewpoint of the relationship subsisting between

¹ cf Chapter VIII, p. 280.

those who bear them. At a still later phase, again, Narasimha is attracted and absorbed by Vishnu, thus becoming an *avatāra* of the greater divine form, who had for long been admitted into the group of deities. But that originally, and indeed for some considerable time, he had had his own circle of worshippers in which, as Narasimha, he was the great god, is proved by the still extant *Narasiṃha Upaniṣads*.¹ On the other hand his subsequent identification with Vishnu, rather than with Rudra, was definitely due to his having originally belonged not to the Rudra, but to the Vishnu type.

I have discussed this particular type of god more fully in my *Gottheit und Gottheiten der alten Arier*.² Its general character is specifically recognizable in connection with the *narasiṃha*, owing to the fortunate circumstance that assertions about it, in very primitive terms, are to be found in Section VI of *The Brihad-Jābāla Upanishad*,³ and this passage provides a quite definite starting-point for our general discussion.

To begin with, then, the *narasiṃha* to which in this narrative the brahman Karuna goes is a *tree* on the river bank; or still more correctly, the *numen immanent* in this tree as a *potent power*, because of which the tree is at once revered and feared. Now the root of this notion of the god is the idea of "Power"—the concept of magical power—which lies concealed in certain outstandingly significant natural objects, which pervades and fills them, which as numinous Power adheres and is bound to them, and yet at the same moment, personified as a *nara*, or a spirit, *residing* in the object, can be worshipped. And the essential characteristic of such a cult, and also of such a being—in this respect quite distinct from the Rudra type—is the immanent unity between this powerful being and its medium

¹ cf. Deussen's Translation, pp. 753 ff.

² Pp. 83 ff.

³ In *The Sāvva Upaniṣads*, edited by A. M. Śāstri, Madras, 1925.

or bearer. For it is in unity with its bearer that it is worshipped—worshipped at once in and with its medium simultaneously. Whoever injures the latter, therefore, at the same time violates the very *numen* which is borne by and contained within it, which permeates and fills it and subsists with it in the unity of its being.¹

It is then from some such primitive idea of immanent numinous “Power”, at first bound to some medium, or “bearer”, of the Power, that the idea of Vishnu itself appears to me to have originated; and quite similarly, the idea of Nārāyana, and perhaps of Vāsudeva also. And this relationship in their type seems to me to be the reason why they merge with each other and finally become synonyms of one and the same great god.

(2). *The religion of the gopas*

(a). The vassals of Krishna. When both Duryodhana and Arjuna turn to Krishna, to invoke his aid in their mutual strife, Krishna gives his vassals to Duryodhana, but to Arjuna he imparts himself.² These his vassals are elsewhere called *bhojas*, *andhakas* and *vrishnis*—terms which are, however, simply the names of tribes or clans. But strange to say, Krishna here characterizes them by the names “*gopas*” and “*nārāyanas*”³—expressions which cannot be clan names; rather do they designate the *vrishnis*, etc., in a different way. Krishna’s *vrishnis*, that is to say, are on the one hand *gopas*, and on the other *nārāyanas*. Both terms are evidently intended to indicate something specific

¹ The logic of this concept of Immanence is evident in *The Gītā*, xi. 40:—“The All pervading, the All therefore art Thou”.

² *Udyogaparvan*, vi. 147.

³ cf. also *Dronaparvan*, Chapter 27, where the *gopālas* and the *nārāyanas* unite in the common cause, exactly as Krishna’s two clans do; cf. further *Karnaparvan*, 53, v. 2564 on the military capacity of the *nārāyanas*.

and peculiar, so as to distinguish the *vrishnis* as typical and distinct from other warriors. The actual fact is that, in contrast to the other troops assembled at the Kuru battle, they are simple and homely "cattle herders" or, in other words, they are tribes leading a semi-nomadic existence; and yet further, they differ *culturally*, and this too specifically, from the others.

Now these two features are encountered, and in a similar context, as characteristic of the *vrishnis* in *The Harivamsha*, Chapters 72 ff., where we are at the same time more clearly informed than in the previous passage what they both mean. For we now meet with a definite consciousness of an unmistakable and at the same moment highly valued *peculiarity* that is equally social and cultural, and is proudly presented as in explicit contrast with alien types, the two aspects being most intimately connected with one another. Thus Krishna appears here as the representative and defender of the ancient *pastoral organization* and its mode of existence against the intrusive agricultural social order, and so at the same time as the representative and the ardent champion of a primitive *cult* and of the old tribal *gods*.

(b). What they regarded as sacred:—*daivatam*. Chapter 72 of *The Harivamsha* relates the desire of some members of his tribe to set about celebrating a festival in honour of the *foreign* god Indra. In the succeeding Chapter, however, Krishna appears as passionately protesting against this: "We are herdsmen", he insists, "roaming about in the woods, we live upon the products of our cattle. Let the tillers of the fields and the travelling merchantmen carry on their own affairs in their own way; let them serve their own gods. Our craft is cattle breeding. To us, cows, forests and mountains are sacred (*daivatam*)."¹ He goes on to demand that a festival be celebrated in honour of their own deities, instead of Indra, according to ancient traditional

usage; the festival, that is to say, of the autumnal lustration (*nīrāñjana*) of the cows which, after the period of long Summer drought and the months of the rainy season, during which they had to remain in their pens, are now going out again to the open pastures of wood and mountain meadows, so that they need ritual purification there, and at the same time to be filled with new "power". And simultaneously this lustration festival is the sacrificial feast for the *numina* which possess and dispense such "power":—for the *numina* of the "mountains", bearing on their slopes wood, meadow and pasture land and filling them with their vital power: "For these are *our* refuge".

This worship of mountains by the *gopas*, in the next place, is of a peculiar type; for the mountain is not revered on account of its sublime impressiveness but, as the entire context clearly shows, avowedly because it is a "power bearer"—because, *exactly like a narasimha tree*, it is filled by numinous power which emanates from it and penetrates the woods and trees, the meadows, grass and cows,¹ while filling and permeating itself too and constituting, in fact, its essential nature to such a degree that the "mountains" themselves, in the most marvellous way, become a kind of spiritual being: spiritual beings which are on the one hand fast bound to their bearers and are indeed identical with these, so that they themselves are still called "mountains", yet which on the other hand are distinguishable from the material heights and can adopt a different form and figure and then, under such a form, roam about as terrifying apparitions "on their own mountain ridges". For all such interrelations as these the term *deha*—"body"—is quite inadequate. Certainly its proper "body" is the mountain as this exists in Nature; but on the other hand this "power" residing in the mount can, whenever it wishes, and by means

¹ This is proved by its name:—*go-vardhana*—"what causes the cows to grow and increase".

of its *Māyā*, its power of transformation, manifest itself in a different form (*rūpa*) and with another body (*deha*).

My own conjecture, therefore, is that *numina* of this kind were at one period called *naras* and *vishnavas*, while from these *naras* and *vishnavas* the great god Nara and Vishnu has arisen; and the Chapters previously cited from *The Harivamśa* appear to me to substantiate this theory.

(c). Krishna's sermon. In Chapter 73, 3812, Krishna says:—

“... the mountains are our unfailing refuge”.

Then he proceeds to describe these “mountains” and to do so, indeed, in terms of the ancient *Sṛuti* or ancient ancestral tradition:—

“The old tale (*Sṛuyante*) relates how the ‘mountains’, assuming different forms at will, can roam about in this forest on their own mountain ridges, now under this guise and again in another. Perchance they become long-maned lions (*cf. nraasimha*) or tigers with extraordinary claws (*cf. the ‘diamond clawed’*), and so they protect their woods by terrifying the woodcutters.¹

¹ “*Their woods*”: the woods belong to them, that is to say, and the same fruitful power that lives in the mountains lives also in the woods and trees, it is called *vanānām lakshmī*. To this power, and likewise to its acquisition, there is a reference whenever anyone, as for example Sankarshana, roams ecstatically in the forests clad in “wood garb”, or clothes made of leaves and blossoms, which are decked with tree-*lakshmī*, and when, even to-day, Nārāyana's fetish images wear the “wood wreath” around their necks, and again in the words from *Taittirīya Samhitā*, v. 2, 8,—“trees are united to Vishnu”. The *lakshmī* of trees, then, is their *āyu*, their life or life-force. Thus in *Karnaparvan*, 7, v. 200, we find the tribe of the *Vanāyu* mentioned:—perhaps a theophoric name for wood dwellers who are at the same time worshippers of trees and of the numinous power immanent in these, while as the magical power in the cows it is called *Śrī*. In *Anuśāsanaparvan*, 82, still further, it is personified, an intriguing *action* being given in this passage why this “power” is especially “located” in cows' urine and dung. Hence

“For whenever those who dwell on the bearers of the woods—that is, on the mountains—set to work to injure the trees, they slay such miscreants, whose crime is that of cannibals.¹

“Brahmans may perform their *mantra* sacrifice (that is the sacrifice according to the *Vedas*), the husbandmen may sacrifice to the furrow—but we *herdsman*s sacrifice to ‘mountains’. For us the *mountain* with its *forest* is worthy of sacrifice.²

“This, meseems, it is right to do. Therefore, O Herdsman, let the mountain sacrifice now be celebrated.

“Let the fortune-bringing sacrificial actions be performed at (or in) the *sthāna*, to the tree or to the mountain.³

“There shall the beasts fit for sacrifice be slain, they—the slain’—being scattered about on a beautiful *āyatana*.⁴

the woods became enchanted woods, absolutely immune to that insolent intruder, the feller of the trees.

¹ Injury to a tree filled with numinous power is worse than mere murder; it is equivalent to the “man-eater’s” conduct—*paurushāda* (cannibalistic).

² Here culture is opposed to culture, and religion to religion, with all the emphasis of a prophet of his own religion.

³ Tree and mountain are “power receptacles”, and probably *sthāna* is to be understood in this sense too; the term itself means “stand” or “station” and also, explicitly, “receptacle” in which something is contained. It may be, therefore, that such natural fetishes are meant as certain specified boulders from the holy mountain, fetish stones like the *śālagrāma* stone (a sacred black stone), or perhaps even artistic fetishes that were regarded as impersonations of the “power”. In any case, there pertains to this cult not simply the mountain cult alone, but still more generally a cult of “power” bearers such as trees, of which the essential characteristic, as distinct from that of the *Vedas*, is that the sacrifice to the *numen* is offered to an object which, as being its container, represents the *numen* and is thought of as being permeated by it. On the other hand the meaning of *sthāna* may have been “the cows’ locality”—the cow-house; and to this may be traced the primitive origin of the custom which demands that Krishna’s birth, even to-day, must be celebrated in a chamber arranged like a cowshed.

⁴ Site. Probably, therefore, specially decorated cult localities belong to this cult.

And now an additional requirement is advanced—the cows, laden with *autumnal* flowers, must circumambulate the mountain, so that they can then be led into the woods to new pasture. For

“Now delightful Autumn has set in, when the downpour from the clouds” (the preceding rainy season) “is over, bringing sweet juicy grass for the cows.”

Whereupon there follows a colourful and extremely vivid description of the newly awakened life force, springing up afresh and stirring in wood and field, in river and sea, in plant and animal and man. This delineation is not merely a beautiful jewel of bucolic lyricism, but is intended to arouse in the hearer some understanding of what will finally be the consummation and climax of the whole affair. This, however, will arise at a later stage of our discussion. Let us first of all pursue the more elementary path of the simpler “power” idea.

(d). “Power” as the Mountain-god. In his appeal to ancestral customs and religion Krishna succeeds: the intrusive Indra is rejected, and the mountain sacrifice and the lustration procession of the cows duly carried out. In this way the legend identifies Krishna himself with the mountain—a later retouching which can readily be analysed in such a way as to permit the original ideas to be recognized anew. At the conclusion of the sacrifice, again, Krishna appears “in mountain form”, and yet standing at the same time on its summit. But, as *v.* 3890 plainly shows, it is, actually, rather the “mountain” itself which, standing on its own base, manifests his epiphany to the herdsmen in a special body (*deha*). It repeats and substantiates what Krishna has already said in his exhortation, and this too in a voice issuing “from the *interior* of the height” (although at that very moment the speaker stands on the

peak), that he and he alone is to be worshipped by the herdsmen.—

“From henceforth shall ye sacrifice to me alone, if ye care aught for your cows. I am your most high god, who graciously fulfils your desires.”

The sacrifice then concludes with processions and merry games which the god stays to watch, while at its close

“The ‘mountain’ with this body” (that is the body that it had assumed by *Māyā* in order to appear on high on the summit) “again became invisible.”

(3). *The idea of Vishnu*

(a). Vishnu as pervading “Power”. Spirits of this kind which, as numinous “powers” and potencies, semi-identical with their bearers and worshipped in and together with these, abide in mountain, rock, tree, *etc.*, are quite different in type from spirits which, like the *rudras*, have arisen from impressions of the *awful*, or the *terrible*, in places and events.¹ For they have a concrete bearer or medium, their *ādhāra*, which as numinous power they pervade, being still further semi-identical with these in virtue of their immanence; they are, in fact, *immanent* spirits. Now one name for “spirits” in general was *nara* or *purusha*, and in this way spirits falling within this class also came to be called *naras* or *purushas*. But I should suppose that, when they were considered individually, they were given the appellation of *vishnus*. This appears to me to be indicated (a) by the specific character of the developed idea of the great Vishnu: and (b) by the etymon *vishnu* itself.

(a). The great Vishnu has always been apprehended as the great “*Pervader*”: thus in *Narisiṁha-pūrva-tapāṇīya*, 2, 4:—

¹ On the characteristics of the *rudra* type cf. my *Gottheit und Gottheiten der alten Arier*, pp. 16–50. *

"Why the expression 'mahā-vishnu'? (Because it is he) who pervades all the worlds, and by them causes himself to be permeated, just as oil in the lumps of sesame dough, that are mixed and kneaded and soaked with it, is reciprocally permeated by them and causes them to be pervaded by itself."¹

This, though on a larger scale, is identical with what holds good for the small tree-*narasimhas* as for the spirits which pervade the "mountain", yet can nevertheless inhabit and haunt their "own mountain ridges", exactly as the great Vishnu can exist over and beyond the Universe. Owing to this capacity for pervasion Vishnu, as I have previously asserted in my *Gottheit und Gottheiten*, is especially the god of the *avatāras* and the āveśas ("enterings"), the god present in natural and artificial *arcas* (images), to be worshipped with and in them, the god of sacred black (*śālagrāma*) stones, *tulasi* plants and other fetishes. And finally, the etymon *vishnu* itself seems to me to point to this, his principal attribute of *immanent* power.

(β). In the *Brihad-devatā*, II. 69, the term *vishnu* is traced to the root *vish*, *viś*, or *vevish*, all three of which mean "permeation"; but here *viś* must be excluded on account of the ś, while in Apte's *Dictionary* *vish* appears in the sense of permeation. The *Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*, 52, 39, too, traces *vishnu* to the same root *vish*. In *The Mahābhārata*, on the other hand, *vishnu* frequently occurs together with victorious (*jishnu*), as well with enduring (*sahishnu*) and radiant (*bhrājishnu*) (*Harivamśa*, 2503); and this indicates a compound of *vi* with the termination *snu*,² the latter derivation having been accepted by Oldenberg in preference to his previous interpretation based on *vi-sanu*; *vi* means "separate, apart, asunder"; and Oldenberg therefore assumed that

¹ Deussen.

² Which is also found, e.g., in *sthāsnu*, *carishnu* (*Dronaparvan*, 9467).

vishnu is to be understood as “he who extends himself far asunder” and believed that the idea of Vishnu arose from the impression of the *extension of Space* which, being experienced as divine, became deified in Vishnu. This view, however, seems to me to attribute far too much to primitive experience; surely such abstract entities as these can hardly have been represented by the extremely concrete image of a *vishnu*.

Now *vi* also means “right through something”, as in the word *vibhu*:—all-pervading. A *vishnu*, therefore, would not be “one who extends himself afar”, but rather “one who extends himself through anything”, and in this sense a permeator or pervader, a *vyāpin*, as in fact Vishnu is invariably styled. But this is precisely the essential characteristic of these powers and potencies with which we are at present concerned. Such powers could scarcely have been more pertinently and happily designated than by the word *vishnu* as employed in this sense, so that the name Vishnu originates neither from speculative ideas about the Universe nor from any extremely abstract notions, but from one of the most primitive, and at the same time very general, of all ancient religious ideas:—from the widely disseminated image, that is to say, of a “power” *numen* which is located in certain objects and fills and permeates these. Assuredly the *acala*-spirit of the preceding legend, and the tree-spirit *narasimha*, are still remote from the idea of Vishnu, the great divine power which, as the inner vital principle and internal controller, pervades the Universe just as “oil permeates the cake”; with regard to their object and their sphere, nevertheless, they are *vibhu*, *vyāpin*, *vishnu*—they are, in other words, permeators. Exactly as the great World-Vishnu has the Universe for his “body”, they too have their medium or bearer for their body, their container, their receptacle; and just as there exists a relation of existential connection between Vishnu and the Universe,

similarly in their case between themselves and their object. On the other hand, however, precisely as Vishnu is not identical with the Universe but transcends it, so likewise is it with these *vishnavas* on a limited and primitive scale.

Thus many of the names appearing in the Vishnu *Litanies* still point back to this primitive sphere of immanent numinous powers and their associated bearers. To some extent they can all be writ large, and then they denote relations pertaining to the god and to the Universe, while on the small scale they can signify wholly primitive relations of immanence between numinous powers and their bearers.

The lists of names of Vishnu, still further, are instructive. Some of these—*tejas*, *tapas*, *ojas*, *sahas* (strength, power), etc.—are literally simple synonyms of the numinously magical power itself quite apart from any personification. Others again—*yaśodhara*, *ūrjaspati*, (preserving glory and maintaining strength)—denote the power *bearer* or medium; and with these must be included *śrī-pati*, *lakshmi-pati*, *śrī-nivāsa*, *lakshmi-nivāsa*,¹ or simply *nivāsa* and *ādhāra* (bearer or medium). In others, still further, the fetishist *bearer*, which immanently conceals the *numen*, appears as a name for a *numen* as such: *vanaspati*, *nyagrodha*, *udumbara*, *asvattha*,² *aushadha*.³ A *śrī-vriksha* is in the first place, then, simply a tree that contains *śrī*—the numinous healing power: subsequently it becomes the god's name. Similarly a *vishnu-śaila*, to begin with, was undoubtedly nothing but a rock penetrated and possessed by a *vishnu*; while in *Harivamśa* 2403 the term is likewise a name of the god

¹ Sustaining numinous healing power, and fortune; the abode of this power and fortune

² Species of fig-tree.

³ A herb. The appellation *viśva-vriksha* is most instructive—“Universe tree”, as in *Nārada Pāñcarātra*, IV 2, 81; *in nuce*, this contains a complete History of Religion. At first the *numen* was, like the *narasimha*, a tree. When it expands into the *numen* of the Universe, there emerges the “Universe tree”.

himself; and thus also with rock and mountain (*adri, giri*), *girirūpin*, *śālagrāma* and *śālariūpin*,¹ exactly as in the assignment of *animals' names* to the *numen*—*vyāla* (tiger), lion and swan, ape and serpent: we are at once reminded of the wild animals in the guise of which the “mountains” could appear. In such a connection, still further, an epithet such as *kauśika*—located in a *kośa* or container—is readily intelligible, while either the “power”, or the possessor of “power”, is also denoted by the expression *sat-nivāsa*. Here, however, it may be seriously questioned whether *sat-nivāsa* had not, originally, the quite concrete denotation of some external, material, numinously magical *object* such as a magical or spirit-tree, a thing, in which *sat* resides. In any case, *sat-nivāsa* originated first of all in no lofty speculative sphere, but is indubitably a very ancient term that pertains to the realm of these primitive magical notions. For *sat* here is synonymous with *asu* and springs from exactly the same root; like *asu*, therefore, *sat* is precisely that magically conceived power which bestows life and strength, growth, *bhuti* (prosperity) and increase:—existence, in fact, as well-being. Ultimately, then, this also becomes the meaning of the word as it occurs in *sātvata*: if to *bhāgavata* there pertains a *bhagavat*, just so to *sātvata* a *satvat*; and if *bhāgavatas* are worshippers of a *bhagavat*, then *sātvatas* are devotees of a *satvat*, that is to say, of some possessor of *sat*. Thus it need arouse no surprise to find the *sātvatas* falling within the ambit under discussion; no name could be more suitable for the relevant notion of spirits and gods. A *Satvat* is the exalted World-God Vishnu, who bears within himself the *sat* of the Universe. But a *satvat* is likewise a *govardhana* who imparts *asu* to the cows and to men and causes them to thrive.²

¹ Mountain-shaped; sacred black (stone) and sacred form.

² For the meaning of *govardhana* cf. p. 244, n. 1. That the idea of *vishnu* arose from that of impersonal Power is quite evident from

253 (b). Vishnu and *Brahman*. Thus it is easily intelligible that the idea of *Brahman* attracted to itself that of Vishnu and became amalgamated with it; both alike, in fact, are ideas about "Power", *Brahman* being the hidden "Power", first of all in the sacrifice, then in all the numinous phenomena of the Universe, and ultimately in the whole Universe in general. The idea of Vishnu, therefore, could become merged and identified with the concept of *Brahman* much more readily than could, for example, that of Rudra.

And what we have previously "heard" about the "spirit", which is (properly speaking) the spirit of the mountain, but which can at the same time appear also in "whatever form it will", especially in that of *wild animals* living on it, also throws light on the remarkable passage in *The Rig Veda*, I. 154, 2:—"Vishnu, who lives in the mountains like the terrible roving wild beast". Exactly so has our *Text* told us that these mountain spirits, assuming whatever guise they wished. "roam about on their own mountain ridges as lions and tigers".

(4). *Vāsudeva*

(a). The root *vas*. Vishnu (to continue) becomes *Vāsudeva*. That the latter name is not a patronymic of Vishnu but that, on the contrary, it is the name of Krishna's father was a conclusion first of all arrived at on etymological grounds from Krishna's appellation, *Vāsudeva*, as was shown by Bhandarkar and Jacobi. The actual name of Krishna's father was *Ānakadundubhi*.¹ What then can

the passage: *Taittirīya Āranyaka*, v. 1, 2, in which the *devas* hold a sacrificial celebration in order to acquire magic power—*rddhi-parimitam yaśas kāmāś*:—"Their sacrifice obtains the *vaishnavaṁ yaśas*". Then this *yaśas* (of Vishnu) escapes and the gods hasten after it to subdue it to their own power. At the same time this passage shows how such impersonal Power immediately becomes personified, since in the words that follow it is a "he" who, as a single individual, resists the crowd. • • • ¹ *Harivamśa*, vv. 1924, 9040.

Vāsudeva have denoted originally, and what is the explanation of its being synonymous with Vishnu?

It appears to me that, at first, a *vishnu* was “power” immanent in some object—“immanent” implying “indwelling” or “abiding” in something. But to dwell or reside in anything is termed *vas*; from which we obtain *vāsa*—dwelling, the stem vowel here having been given the *guna* gradation, whence *vāsu* must mean a *dweller*. In fact, therefore, a *vāsu-deva* is simply synonymous with *vishnu*: both alike mean, first of all, indwelling, permeating power or potency. The word *vāsu*, however, also appears in isolation as a designation for Krishna;¹ and a *vāsudeva* is merely the expanded form of this—a resident spirit. Thus *The Ahrbuddhnya Samhitā*, p. 550, v. 65:—

“Because the Universe is immanent in him and because he is immanent in the Universe: that is the meaning of *Vāsu*.”

By utilizing the root *vas*, then, we trace the etymology of *vāsu* as the immanent, indwelling Being,² and the fact that the universal god, immanent in the Universe, is also thereby straightway brought to mind is the outcome of a later theology; nonetheless the original sense of *vas* and *vāsu* is retained, while further insight into the *primitive* intuition which underlies a *vas* of this type is provided by another passage from *The Harivamśa*, in which Krishna bestows on the mountain Pāripātra gifts of grace with the words³:—

“Underneath thee—that is in the subterranean region Shatpura—great devils dwell (*nivasanti*). These have been overcome by me; henceforth they shall nevermore come out from thee, having been overwhelmed by me. After the way

¹ cf. Apte, *Dictionary*, sub *vāsu*.

² cf. *Udyogaparvan*. 2561: *vaśanāt sarvabhūtānām*. *Vāsudevas tato vedyah*; (within all beings. Thus Vāsudeva is to be known).

³ 7610 ff.

of escape has been closed to them, at my command they shall perish. And (in their place) I myself, O Great Mountain, shall be concealed in thee (*tvayi sannihita*). The lord over those terrible ones, I shall dwell in thee (*nivatsyāmi*); and whosoever, filled with *Bhakti*, has an image made from thy stones (of the *numen*) and will serve me, shall find his way to me.' And henceforth from that hour the divine lord (Krishna) Acyuta was hidden in the mountain, and they make an image from (the mountain) stones and serve him, with self-restraint and yearning for the world of Vishnu."

The parallel with what happens in the case of Mount Govardhana is perfectly obvious; for here too the Krishna cult is identified with that of an ancient mountain *numen*, immanent therein, and worshipped in fetishes made of its stones (*sthāna?*); further, the relation between this *numen* and the mountain and the fetishes is expressed by the root *vas*.

An additional reference may be relevant; when the Sāgarids¹ dig down to the depths of the Earth in their search for their father's sacrificial horse which has escaped, they encounter a "*kapila*"² deep in the Earth's interior—a frightful being which burns them to ashes, evidently because they have insolently violated its own dwelling-place. This being, continues the narrator, "has been called *vāsudeva*"; and to his mind, presumably, this *vāsudeva* is forthwith identical with the great World-god Vāsudeva, immanent in the entire Universe. But we may readily conjecture that, originally, simply the *vāsu* of this place, the spirit immanent in the Earth's interior and "residing" there, was intended, who is himself injured when his *deha* is violated.

¹ *Vanaparvan*, 8880.

² But of course this *kapila* cannot be a *rishi*, as the narrator appears to assume; originally it doubtless denoted a ghostly spirit-being, something like a *babhru*.

(5). *Nārāyana*

It is undeniable that *nārāyana* is in some way connected with *nara*, and in the Epic Nara and Nārāyana are closely associated as two intimately related divine beings.¹ Foreign to the Vedic circle though they are, an attempt is made to affiliate them to this system with the help of the dogmatic methods then available; they are either declared to be *pūrve devās*, or ancient gods,² or they are transformed into ancient *rishis*. In their own proper homeland, however, they were the greatest names of gods; what then is their meaning, and how is *nara* related to *nārāyana*?

(a). *nara* and *Nara*: *nara*, to begin with, means man. But I believe that I have shown elsewhere that, in mythological *Texts*, *nara* is not to be simply translated by "man";³ and here we are concerned with "men" of a quite peculiar type. For the "man" who resides in the Sun or the ether, in fire and the moon, in the eye, the heart, the echo and the shadow, etc., is not a man but a "spirit", and at a still higher stage a god. Thus *narasimha* does not mean a "man-lion" but a "spirit-lion". He is a *nara*, a "resident spirit" immanent in the tree, equivalent to a *vāsudeva* who

¹ In the frequent formulas for worship at the beginning of the Sections, Nara and Nārāyana are evidently thought of as being of one nature; cf. *Udyogaparvan*, 1937: *Nārāyano Naraś ca eva sattvam ekam, dvidhā kritam*.—Nārāyana and Nara are verily one being, twofold made.

² e.g. *Dronaparvan*, 9480: *pūrvadevānām paramān*—the highest of the former gods.

³ *Gottheit und Gottheiten*, p. 29. Although the "kimnaras, gandharvas and naras" are grouped together in *The Mahābhārata*, 396, still these *naras* are not men but spirits; and though we find, in *Dronaparvan*, 9507, "viśveśvaram viśvanaram" both together, again it is not a "Universal man" that is meant, but Nara—the god of the Universe. Finally, in *Śāntiparvan*, 280, v. 10 076, Nara appears as the great god of a specific group of worshippers who are placed by the side of the devotees of Mahādeva and of Vishnu, of *Brahman* and others.

as a *kāmarūpin* (like the immanent mountain spirits already alluded to) can rush out from his *sthāna* in the terrible form (*rūpa*) of a lion. Out of the general circle of *naras*, however, arises Nara, exactly as does Rudra from the group of *rudras*, and Vishnu from that of the *vishnavas*; Nara, then, is the high god. He appears in theophoric names such as, e.g., in Naradatta, which is synonymous with Devadatta and, like the latter, means Theodore; similarly with Naragupta and Naravarman. As Nara he is in *Harivamśa*, I. 1, 1, and in many introductory formulas, *narottama*, the highest of all *naras*, synonymous with *puruṣottama* (the highest person), both being well-known synonyms and names for Vishnu-Vāsudeva.

(b). *nārāyana*: its first interpretation. The inclusion of *naras* within a single group finds its completion in the personal Nara, although a different synthesis, in impersonal form, is also possible. Just as to *deva*, therefore, there pertains the alternative *daivam*, so to *nara* belongs the form *nāram*; and as the first denotes the incorporation of "devic" power in abstract terms, so does *nāram* that of "naric" power and essence. It has however been objected that *nāram* never occurs in any other context; but this need cause no surprise, since *nara* and Nara itself were subsequently supplanted by other designations for spirits or gods. But *Brihadbrahma Samhitā*, 665, employs *nāram*, and it was not compelled to invent this word *ad hoc*, since the interpretation of *nārāyana* by *nara*, instead of by *nāram*, was available and is, indeed, utilized by it. Still more important, however, is the fact that in the list of Vishnu names in *Narada Pāñcarātra*, IV. 8, 120, which includes other ancient expressions, *nāraśāyin* is found as one of the names for Vishnu; and it seems to me that this can only mean:—"he who rests or dwells in a *nāram*"—that is the spirit residing in a "naric" object, such as an old magic tree.

What then is *nārāyana*? *ayana* means "place" and even, taken literally, "dwelling place";¹ *nārāyana*, therefore, as a *bahuvrīhi* means "he who has his dwelling place in a *nāram*"—for instance, in some numinous natural object such as a *śālagrāma* stone, or in a tree or the mountain Govardhana, or in any other natural fetish. In other words, *nārāyana* means nothing but a *nāra-śāyin*; and just as the worshippers of Mahādeva, Vishnu and Śiva are called *māhadevas*, *vaishnavas* and *śaivas*, so the *gopas* who revere *nārāyanas* are called *nārāyanas*. The vowel modification (*vriddhi*) which appears in these forms cannot be observed in the equivalence between *nārāyana* and *nārāyana*-worshipper simply because *nārāyana*, as the object of worship, had itself already undergone the vowel modification just referred to.²

(c). *nārāyana*: its second interpretation. The god of Autumn. But perhaps, after all, this interpretation is too superficial; and we must assuredly guard against seeking the sense of ancient names of gods on the heights of speculation while primitive explanations lie ready to hand. Alternatively, however, their meaning may elude us if they were actually derived from religious intuitions of any higher level; and this may be the case with Narayana. We must, then, pursue the *Text of The Harivamśa* still further.

After Krishna has issued his summons to the mountain sacrifice, his utterance assumes the form of an agitated and

¹ Apte's *Dictionary*, 3, "place, site, abode".

² That the *adjective* qualifying the substantive *nārāyana*, in the sense of pertaining to *nārāyana*, is itself *nārāyana*, is proved by *Anuśāsanaparvan*, 139, v. 6303, *nārāyanam tejas*—that is "the 'heat' pertaining to the *nārāyana*", or "the *nārāyanic 'heat'*", while at the same time this passage elucidates the original connection and relation between the idea of "power" and its personification. The *Nārāyana* incarnate in Krishna, elsewhere strictly regarded as a person, is here still a *tejas*, a magical power, which Krishna can radiate from himself like a great devouring fire; then it streams back to him, and, "like a docile pupil", touches the feet of the mighty magician, and afterwards quite plainly flows into him again.

extremely impressive description of the *life* which is awaking and manifesting itself powerfully everywhere in refreshed autumnal Nature—life which has newly awakened after the deadly Summer drought and its subsequent rain storms; and he concludes this characterization with the words:—

“Now the *devas* awaken him who, during the torrents from the clouds, has *slumbered* deeply: the highest of the thirty gods.”

This refers to Vishnu-Nārāyana; and in this quotation a *specially old* tradition must have been preserved, since the words *contradict* later Vishnu theology and, from its own point of view, are really a restriction of Vishnu’s majesty. Certainly, according to the later conceptions, Vishnu is he who in his own good time sleeps and then awakens; these periods of Vishnu’s slumber and awakening, nevertheless, are the great eras of the *World*, during which the Universe is enveloped in its latent phase, in order after innumerable æons again to emerge from *World-repose*. In the citation just given, however, nothing more is implied than Nature’s *annual* renewal by sinking to rest in time of drought, the anticipatory repose of the rain storm period when men and animals tarry, fixed to one spot, inactive and confined, followed by the new blossoming of life in the refreshing and animating *Autumn* season when the rainy months are over.

This extremely ancient notion, which was perhaps the root of the other and far more widespread idea,¹ recurs in *The Harivamśa*; in Chapter 154, for instance, Krishna’s son Pradyumna gives a vivid portrayal of the current *rainy season*; then he continues:—

“Now sleep has overcome the world’s refuge, the lord, Upendra, (that is, Vishnu).”

¹ cf. *Sānūtparvan*, 232, v. 8551: “As the manifold characteristics of past seasons are repeated (in the new year), so too (in the series of world periods) the forms of Brahmā, Hara, etc.”

And in paying homage to Krishna, Indra offers to covenant with him that he himself shall rule over the rainy season while Krishna, and hence Nārāyana, shall govern *Autumn*, when everything grows and thrives anew. Then Indra describes Autumn and concludes:—

“Fruitful Autumn arrives, when thou shalt have *arisen from sleep*.”¹

In the passage just cited, too,² this conception of Nārāyana as the animating god of the seasons is clearly discernible. It is true that Krishna-Nārāyana appears here first of all simply as a great magician who gives the onlooking *rishis* an edifying exhibition of his magical power by parching a great, blossoming mountain, and then reanimating it and filling it once more with flowers and trees and the sounds of newly awakened birds and beasts. But the admiring praises of the *rishis* at once show the real meaning of all this:—

“Thou art Winter and Summer, thou art the *time of rain*.”

This means only that here too there is an echo of an original personification of some “power”, parching the vegetation in Summer in order to bring it to life again in the rainy season.

The significance of this god, who goes to rest and in Autumn awakes again, is now perfectly obvious. The whole conception is linked with the ideas of a “power” immanent in mountain, wood and tree, in human and animal life, which is at the same time the “*asu*”, life, the wonderful and mysterious life-force located in objects.³ This power has its annual period of envelopment and immobility, of peace and repose, and then of new awakening and breaking out

¹ *Harivamśa*. Is the idea of such an “Autumn god” contained in the (theophoric?) proper name Śaradvat?

² *Anuśāsanaparvan*, 139.

³ It may also be called *lakshmi*; cf. *Harivamśa*, 3837, *vanānām dvigunā lakshmi*.

afresh. Within this the individual powers have been united to form a *single* great Power throughout all Nature, the separate *naras*, *vishnus* and *vāsus* into the One Vishnu, Nara, Vāsu. When he goes to rest Nature does the same, and when he awakes Nature awakes too, and all in the regular succession of seasons in each year. And thus the primitive cult of the power-bearing mountains, trees and woods, *etc.*, and of the potencies residing in them, has developed to the higher level of a cult devoted to the One, immanent in *all* Nature and filling, animating and sustaining it with its own life.

“Developed”, we say, lightly and superficially. But exactly as with the primitive idea of Power in general, so with this its higher phase; and the term “development” is here of but slight assistance towards comprehension. For it is in truth a matter of a quite specific type of intuition which can certainly be observed, recorded and co-ordinated, but whose “How” and “Whence” can be no further elucidated. The *transition*, therefore, from the power of life, and bliss, located in the *govardhana*¹ and its enchanted woods and meadows, to the intuition of the sole *God*, the universal God, living and moving in all Nature and ultimately in the whole Universe, which He develops from Himself and again envelops within Himself, including it and its Being within His own Being, is not “development” at all, but a new and wholly underivable intuition which presupposes the intuitive *seer*; and it matters no whit whether he is called Krishna or by some other name.

This idea of a god who reposes and awakes again may throw new light on the word *Nārāyana* and on the connection between this and *nara*.² The termination *ayana*, then, has two meanings—pertaining to a *gotra* (clan) and, together with this, origin and descent from the *gotra*’s ancestor; its significance is thus patronymic. In this connection I

¹ *cf.* p. 244, n.

remember a conversation which I had many years ago with Oldenberg, in which he interpreted *nārāyana* as "the descendant" of the *nara*, he believed that *nara* should be understood as the *Purusha* of the *Purusha-sūkta*,¹ and *nārāyana* as the principle of the Universe that had arisen from the *Purusha*, while he regarded the word *nārāyana* as the product of loftier speculation, from which it had then passed into popular usage. I should myself, however, consider all this to be far too speculative and abstract a conception; although at the same time there is no doubt that what, on the one hand, was apprehended by means of the figure of a sleeping and reawakening god, would also be thought about in terms of a deity who disappears, who goes to rest, who withdraws (as it were) into retirement, and of *his son* or *descendant* who succeeds him in his new and youthful power, as the *yuvarāja* (young king) following the one who has departed; and an echo of this still seems to resound in the story that Indra, after being overcome, explicitly carries out the consecration of the youthful Krishna as the young *king* assuming authority:² a dedication that is at the same moment conceived as a bestowing of power on the world, as becomes clear at the close of the passage recounting Krishna's coronation:—

"The Earth is freed from the water that has inundated it, again the winds blow softly, the sun pursues its course undisturbed, and the long vanished moon shines once more. The plagues" (fevers during the rainy season?) "decline, the trees bud anew and the world is suffused with ambrosia in (and by) the coronation of Krishna."

Thus, by magic ritual, new strength is imparted to the young king of life himself, and with him at the same time to the world.³ This too accords with the type of ideas

¹ *cf.* p. 149, n.

² *Harivamśa*, 4004.

³ It may be conjectured that the rites of such an *abhisheka* (sprinkling with water) were formerly associated with the cult of the young

under discussion: by ritual and magical methods man everywhere attempts to assist Nature's newly arising life, personified in the forms of gods or heroes, to obtain its fresh energy and to enhance this. And within the same sphere falls the legend of Krishna's childhood and the still flourishing cult of *Bāla-Krishna*,¹ which some authorities have unreasonably tended to regard as a transference of the legend of Christ's childhood. All that is here related about Krishna is, however, quite obviously a transposition of ancient rites and myths which at one time concerned a

god of Autumn. These may have consisted in sprinkling his representatives, or his fetish or image, with fresh Autumn milk, just as the legend narrates that at the *abhisheka* the cows sprinkled Krishna with their milk, and that Indra does the same with celestial milk from golden vessels. With this, too, may be connected Nārāyana's enigmatical epithet, *kumbha-prabhava*, "he who springs from the (milk?) pail". In his *Among the Hindus, A Study of Hindu Festivals*, p. 163 (Cawnpore, 1933), R M Lall asserts that "in some parts of Central India, especially in the Central Provinces and in Berar, the ceremony of the birth of Krishna is observed in another way also: On this day a pitcher full of curd is hung on a tree some eight feet above the ground, under which both the old and the young dance vigorously before the birth of Krishna, which takes place exactly at midnight". (Thus the young god is new born every year) "At this time dancers break the pitcher and the curd, that falls on them, is caught in their hands and eaten as (grace) *prasad*" Here one can almost see the *kumbha-prabhava*. In his *Über die Krishna-janmāshṭami* (*Abhandlungen der Kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1869), H. Weber has given a detailed description of the customs at Krishna's birth. Here too the *kumbha* (pitcher) continues to play its part; and the adoration of the young god in his image is celebrated over a *kumbha*. The connections thus appear to me to be quite clear. In the fresh milk in the pail the magic "power" is worshipped which has once again stimulated it in the cows, while on the other hand this very power is itself furthered and increased by the manipulations to which its bearer or medium is submitted. The young god's birth-place is arranged as a cow-stall, and a doll-like image of him utilized. Krishna's exhortation in *The Harivamśa* itself prescribed worship in the *sthāna*, which we had to conjecture to be the *sthāna* of the cows

¹ cf. the magnificent description of this cult in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*.

vegetation spirit, the “child” being the newly awakening magic life-force. The manipulations and rites which tend it and assist its development assume the guise of care for an imperilled child which must be protected from snares, and for whom its foes lie in wait; and thus a child myth arises, which at the same time attracts to itself other mythical material with which it amalgamates. The next phase is its transference, in the form of a story of his childhood, to some leader and prophet who has played a decisive part in the expansion of such a religion. Finally, the latter is himself elevated to the status of the god whose cult he has fostered and advanced.

It is, therefore, easily intelligible how the figure of Nara, who had in fact gone (as it were) into retirement, must fade away before that of Nārāyana, who is precisely the god in whom mankind is interested, from whom he expects life, existence and all goods of the present time, with whom alone he is concerned in his worship and with whose vital force he himself yearns to be filled.

(d). The roots of later Krishna-*Bhakti*. In this relation of Nara to Nārāyana, still further, it should be a simple matter to recognize the root of the specific doctrine of the *vyūhas* (emanations), which subsequently becomes so characteristic of *Bhāgavata* religion. Nara and Nārāyana would then, in fact, be related to one another just as these *vyūhas* are, these “sunderings” of one and the same fundamental Being into two hypostases. In this mode of honouring the god, moreover, we can observe the root of later *Bhakti*, since it takes the form of enthusiastically roaming the woods in ecstatic joy. In exactly the same way Nārada, the *Bhagavat bhakta*, subsequently wanders ardently through the land with his lyre (*vīnā*), and encounters the god “in lovely woods” and at the foot of the forest trees. So, too, in after years the singers seized by *Bhakti*, the *ālvārs*, travel enraptured from place to place, while in Vrindāvana

Caitanya roves in revelry, imitating his prototype Krishna. The intoxicating *kirtana* (hymn), again, is always a characteristic feature of the *Bhakti* cult.

(e). Baladeva. Certain conjectural suggestions may also be in place here. Krishna's brother, Sankarshana-Baladeva-Balabhadra, simultaneously his *alter ego* and his playfellow, leaves his brother for the time being in order to return from afar to the herdsmen, once more with them to roam, scouring the woods and mountains, while at the same time permitting himself to be loved, praised and honoured by the herdsmen just as Krishna was. Now this story, in its own context, is quite devoid of any reasonable motive. Should its elucidation, then, be sought in the fact that together with the notion of the sleeping and awakening god, or the god reincarnated in his descendant, there subsisted in a parallel symbolism the idea of two *brothers*? One of them wanders afar, never to return, while the other arrives in his stead and enters into the lordship, thus representing the newly active life force (*bala*). It may be that the name which Sankarshana frequently bears implies this, since he is also called Baladeva. Is it possible that originally a god Baladeva, the *deva* who, as the new god, brings back the "power" of the old one and makes it active again, was placed beside Vāsudeva? The parallelism between the designations Vāsudeva and Baladeva is unquestionably most impressive, and permits the conjecture that Baladeva was primarily the name, not of a human but of a divine figure, and was transferred to Krishna's brother, Sankarshana, only when the former had himself received the name Vāsudeva; and perhaps *v. 3778* of *The Harivamśa* also points to this, where it is related how Sankarshana became afraid of the demon Pralamba whom he was riding, and who suddenly grew up under him from a small form to monstrous size and then threatened him. Krishna exhorts him to remember that he, Sankarshana, is *Nārāyaṇa*, and that in this his divine

form he must smite the demon “*balena’s*” head; and it proceeds:—

“Then with clenched fist he struck the demon on the head, by this realization of his proper self filled with *bala*, which permeates the three worlds.”

Equally noteworthy is it that in *Karnaparvan*, 6, v. 143, we find the clans of the *nārāyanas* and the *bala-bhadras* closely associated together.¹

(f). Western Aryan parallels. But of course such ideas of immanent power, and of its personifications in spirits and gods, were not confined to the shepherd tribes around Mathurā and Vrindāvana; they are, on the contrary, very ancient. It may indeed be assumed that mythical figures, like those occurring in Krishna’s sermon, formed the subjective material of primitive Aryan, and perhaps too of pre-Aryan, times, and this despite the restricted rôle which they play in the *Vedas*. For even in their detailed aspects these beings, born from immanent “power” and worshipped in tree and wood, in meadow and mountain, show the clearest relationship with those forms which W. Mannhardt has discussed in his classical Work, *Der Baumkultus der Germanen und ihrer Nachbarstämme*.² The “Wood and Tree Spirits, as Vegetation Demons”, treated in his fourth Chapter, are nothing other than our *naras*, *vishnus*, *nara-simhas*, *vāsus*, *nāraśāyins* and *nārāyanas*, and the customs observed with regard to the former resemble very closely

¹ In his *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra* (Madras, 1916), p. 144, Otto Schrader observes that “the original worship, proved by archeology and the Buddhist scriptures, of only Vāsudeva and Baladeva can signify nothing else than that by the original *pāñcarātrins* Krishna was worshipped as the transcendent highest god, and his brother, ‘the god of strength’, as his immanent aspect. . . .” This might well be a later theological development of the original conception of two brother gods, identical in attributes, in accordance with my own conjecture,

² Berlin, 1857.

those which have been maintained to this day at the *Krishna-janmāṣṭamī* (Krishna's birthday) in India. To quote Mannhardt himself:—

“We find the tree-soul conceived as the Genius of *growth*. But since in the annual rejuvenation of the plant world in Spring, and again in its decay in Autumn, the seasonal change is most clearly manifested, it is obvious that the intuition of the *demon of vegetation*, embodied in the tree, readily changes into a personification of Spring or Summer”—in this case however, it must be observed, of Autumn—“and, still further, receives this name. The ordinary man, nonetheless, unaccustomed to abstraction and unschooled in conceptual distinctions, never separates these different phases from one another, so that vegetation, Spring and Summer”—but once more in this instance, Autumn—“and the protective and representative tree-spirit, all frequently become merged by him in one single idea”.¹ Mannhardt also cites examples of such tree-spirits changing into wood- and mountain-spirits, field- (and meadow-) spirits,² while in his *Contents*³ he observes that “the soul of the tree becomes a generalized vegetation-spirit and is transformed into a personification of the good season”. He proceeds to show, still further, how these forms, sprung from the idea of immanent power, combine with all kinds of other creations of mythical fantasy. In this respect, however, he seems to me not to distinguish sufficiently clearly between the various resultants—inadequately, in other words, between figures of the *vishnu* type, which arose from the idea of power, and those of the *rudra* type that originated in the feeling of numinous terror. Actually, both types merge quite naturally with one another, since both are brought into mutual association by “numinous affinity”. The lists of Vishnu's names, therefore, always include some which can be traced back to the second root, while on the other

¹ P. 155.

² P. 102.

³ P. xii.

hand the “green trees”, though certainly completely isolated, are nevertheless to be found in the *Satarudriyam* (a hymn), the *rudras* of which are *not* in any case derived from the concept of immanent “Power”.

In fact, then, the great divine form of *The Gītā* may well have been developed from a common and primitive Aryan root, subject however to the distinction that, in the East, this root retained its motive power and prepared the way for the highest conception, while in the West it lost its numinous potency. We have here, indeed, one instance of the “ascending and descending *numina*”, with which I have dealt in Chapter VI of my *Gefühl des Überweltlichen*.

But elevation to concrete divine form is undoubtedly very much older than Krishna. *Gopas* like those around Mathurā are to be encountered elsewhere also; and that Brahmanism found itself, at so early a stage, compelled to incorporate the form of Vishnu, as Upendra, in its Pantheon, was certainly not the mere outcome of this small group of *vrishnis* and *andhakas*. *The Chāndogya Upanishad*, III. 17, 6, seems to me, however, to be the first attempt from the point of view of Brahmanism to claim for itself, in one way or another, Krishna the son of Devakī.

That Krishna himself was a historical figure is indeed quite indubitable. From behind the veils of the legend in *The Harivamśa* features rise into prominence which combine together to form a readily intelligible figure, amply substantiated by historical analogies: a man in whom the ideals of his ancient race still live, who rescues and extricates his people from the influences of an intrusive foreign culture which is destroying its communal life, becomes its leader and at the same time, as the preserver and reformer who moulds afresh the ancient ancestral cult, acquires the status of its religious hero. He intends his people to be and to remain *gopas* who freely “roam from wood to wood”, not contemptible *glebae adscripti* like the worshippers of Indra;

to continue as *nārāyanas* and not to become *mantra-yajñas* and *sītā-yajñas* like the others. And as the primeval Jahveh and Elohim, owing to Moses' founding of a community that serves a Jahveh and in him is united, indeed newly created, become the great divine Form of the *Old Testament*, so too among Krishna's *gopas* the figure of the sleeping and awakening god of Autumn, which obscurely arises from the *naras* and *vishnus*, the *narasimhas* and *vāsus*, grows into that of Vishnu-Nārāyana-Vāsudeva who subsequently, in the community of the *bhāgavatas* thus created, expands into the great Īśvara of *The Gītā*. It is at the same time obvious that Garbe is wrong in conceiving this god of the *bhāgavatas*, who evolved as I have just tried to explain, too closely in terms of the analogy with the notion of the purely transcendent God of the *Old Testament* type. It is true that this Īśvara, developed in this manner, is actually no mere deification of "the Universe"; nevertheless the Universe, as his *deha*, subsists in the closest community of Being with him, while this idea of God is purely and correctly expressed in the words "Vāsudeva is all".¹ Just as each *narasimha* and each "mountain spirit" possess their tree and mountain not only as one instance of themselves, but simultaneously "are" the tree and the mountain in the sense that they belong most closely and essentially to one another, so too with the relationship of Vishnu-Vāsudeva to Nature and to the Universe. The *Prakṛiti* is in fact God's "own" *Prakṛiti*, and by virtue of it He is in very truth "the thread on which all things are strung" (vii. 7).

(g). The assimilation of the fairy tale of the Far-striding Dwarf. Ancient cosmogonic myths of the tortoise and the wild boar had been connected with the figure of Prajāpati (the original form of *avatāras*?); and when Vishnu-Nārāyana had become the great God of the Universe and of creation, these were transferred to Him. At a much earlier date,

¹ vii. 19.

presumably, Vishnu had also assimilated to himself the old mythical fairy tale of the *dwarf* who, outwitting his opponent, gains the whole Earth by his three giant strides; and that this story is not at all concerned with a "sun god", but was originally a typical ancient magical and mythological fairy tale, appears to me to have been convincingly demonstrated by Oldenberg.¹ Nonetheless the question still remains:—How, and in what sense, could this tale become explicitly attached to the figure of Vishnu?

In my *Gefühl des Überweltlichen*² I have discussed the reason why Power *numina*, regarded as immanent, could be imaginatively pictured as *dwarf* figures. How the old fairy tale of the three paces and the gigantic stride subsequently becomes modified appears to me still to be perceptible in the account of the Vāmana incarnation in *Harivamśa* 4265 ff., where the "strides" of the ancient legend become the stages of the "dwarf's" own *growth*, the phases of his own expansion and permeation of the Universe, and at the same time of his possession thereof:—

"When the oath (by the water) was sworn, then the dwarf ceased to be a dwarf, and then the Lord showed his form, containing all the *devas*. The Earth as his feet, the sky as his head, sun and moon as his eyes. . . ." Verse 14 310 ff., again—"As he strides over the Earth, the sun and moon reach up to his breast. As he strides farther on to the sky, they reach up to his hips. As he strides to the highest place of all, they lie at his feet."

It is clear that the old mythical story could take its own

¹ cf. Pralamba, already alluded to, which from being a small figure suddenly becomes a giant; but these are tricks of fairy-tale spirits, not cosmogonic mysteries. Quite similarly is the story assimilated by Vishnu, about the *grateful fish* which saves Manu from the Flood, a typical myth-fairy-tale. In this, too, occurs the swelling up from a little form to monstrous size.

² P. III, 2; cf. *Sāntiparvan*, 286, v. 10 450:—"may the spirits, as big as my thumb, residing in bodies, protect me".

place as soon as the idea of the numinous power immanent in tree and mountain, in Earth and stone, in forest and all Nature became exalted to the immanent World Power which permeates, to an ever increasing degree, all provinces and spheres, ultimately filling and possessing the Universe which it dominates. Here again, therefore, we are concerned with no mere chance addition of a mythological fairytale, but rather with a great, profound and expanding religious intuition, which utilizes the *motif* of a legendary myth. Nonetheless is it wholly analogous to the intuition just referred to: just as in that instance the God of all World eras and World *periods* develops out of the god who *yearly* goes to rest with the destroying Summer heat, and reawakes in Autumn, so here the idea of locally immanent numinous power rises by degrees to the World-ruling Power, which gradually penetrates all *spheres* and makes them the domain of its own lordship and energy.

(h). *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XII. 6, 1. This, being the oldest passage that refers to Nārāyaṇa, I should regard as evidence of the idea of a progressive and penetrative appropriation of the Universe by a *vishnu-nārāyaṇa* which was, originally, conceived quite primitively. Here the question concerns a *Purusha Nārāyaṇa*, *Purusha* being nothing but a *nara*, a powerful "spirit". He outstrikes all beings and becomes the Universe, thus mightily expanding himself until he permeates all that exists. But according to Brahmanic speculation, he achieves this by performing an act of sacrificial *magic*. The pre-Brahmanic, and at the same moment the *more primitive*, phase of all this, however, had been the appropriation of the mythical fairy tale of a magic being taking its three far-reaching strides—*urukrama*, "far striding", and *urugāya*, "far advancing". And this "striding" too, in fact, is to be understood from the viewpoint of *magical* notions. For by striding in various directions the magician wishes to gain wide realms against

wicked foes, both men and evil spirits. In *shaman* rites, again, such strides are *ascents* of a ladder whereon the *shaman* mounts to the heavenly heights where dwell the gods; and a similar practice is still found when the sacrificer climbs up a post to a disc representing the sun; with this Vishnu's "highest stride" may be compared. The Brahmanic idea just alluded to, as well as this ancient magical notion, are assimilated to a power-being which, originally residing as power in certain specified natural objects, *expands by virtue of prophetic intuition* and develops into the immanent Power-principle of the whole Universe.

(6). *The correction of my Title*

In this respect, strictly speaking, I am negating my own Title; for, ultimately, the "origin" of the idea of the great god Vishnu is not that sphere of primitive magic notions which I have just discussed. These, indeed, form that curious mist out of which something wholly different breaks forth increasingly:—the idea, that is to say, of the absolutely transcendent *numen*. Themselves born from the first agitations of numinous apperception, these notions then become the incentives for the eruption of this latter concept into consciousness; and while it certainly always retains the hues of its primitive origin, nevertheless it steadily outranges this. While therefore it unquestionably springs from amidst such factors, it does not literally originate therein, and it is not their product. It finds its roots, on the contrary, in the mysterious predisposition of man's spirit for something that is absolutely superior to the Universe and which, aroused and set in motion by primitive apperceptions, is the generating and propelling restlessness in ideational constructiveness, until from behind the veil of origins the great *Īśvara* of *The Gītā* advances into the light. The philosophical investigation of this "predisposition" has

been carried out by J. F. Fries, while de Wette has linked it with the History of Religion, it forms, still further, the legitimate aspect of the unsubstantiated theory of so-called “Primitive Monotheism”.

(III). “BHAKTI” AS CONTRASTED WITH “SĀNKHYA”
AND “YOGA”

Treatises II and VI show how *Bhakti* theology utilizes the *Sāṅkhya*, and at the same time assigns to *Yoga* its due status as merely a subordinate phase. In the long run, however, *Bhakti* theology could tolerate neither the cold *Sāṅkhya* ideal of the *Kaivalyam* (isolation from the world), nor its doctrine of the inactivity of the self, although the latter principle is modified at a later stage by the admonition to recognize not oneself, but “the Lord”, as He who effects all in all. It was also inevitably compelled to reject the *yogin*’s independent goal of salvation in the *siddha* state, while it could retain the systematic *Yoga* discipline only in so far as this assisted it to direct “the mind” entirely upon “the Lord”, as had already been inculcated in Treatise I, together with the regulated contemplative discipline by means of certain *Yoga* methods whereby the *sākshātkāra*, or the visual imagination of the divine Form, was attained; this also continued to be a familiar feature. Nevertheless it is obvious that the ideal of the search for salvation, and the experience thereof, that was common to both *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*, was something fundamentally too profoundly alien to *Bhakti*; and from all this the recognition necessarily followed that even *Yoga* proper, not to speak of *Sāṅkhya*, was impossible even as a subordinate grade of personal experience. This mutually exclusive antithesis between *Bhakti* on the one hand, and *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* on the other, is shown in a particularly impressive way in the following legend about Vishnu-

dharma, a king of Dravida, who despairs of life because he cannot find the One whom he has long been seeking:¹ "I will destroy my life", he declares, "if I behold him not"; then there comes to him an unknown, named Śrīvatsa, and they converse thus:—

Śrīvatsa: "O King, why liest thou on the ground on a bed of grass? What doest thou here, righteous man as thou art?"

Vishnu-dharma: "Men care not for that on which everything depends:—seeking and finding God. But to this I aspire: O that I may succeed! For the sole end of our bodily life is that we ourselves may behold the Lord of the Universe, the Supreme One. To him, though we know him not, and to attaining him, are we destined. If we find him not, what is the use of all else that gives us any pleasure in this our body?"

"Everything which is visible or audible here in this world is nothing but Nature in her many changes and in her manifold forms. But he who is the basis of this whole shifting world, changing from moment to moment—if I may not behold him, vain is my life: what use is it to me? If I attain not him who is above all things and is the highest goal, what at all have I gained? He whose splendour fills all things with splendour, who himself can be filled with splendour from no other source—if he remains unknown to me, vain is my life: what use is it to me? He of whose bliss all the bliss in man's life is but a faint reflection—if I gain not such bliss, then vain is my life: what use is it to me? He whose lordship upholds this whole Universe as it moves and stays—if I come not to know his lordship, vain is my life. what use is it to me? The undefiled water wherewith his feet are cleansed purifies the whole triple world—if I take not refuge in him alone, vain is my life: what use is it to me? To be his servant is the sole joy of

¹ *Brihadbrahma Saṁhitā*, III. 1 ff.

Brahmā, Rudra and all the other celestial ones:—if I cannot become his servant, vain is my life: what use is it to me?”

“The object of all the sacred writings is in the invisible alone; and how can he find salvation who does not himself know the invisible Being (of the Supreme)? The sole aim of our vision is to behold his eternal abode (*Vaikuntha*), and of our hearing to hearken to his word. He who fills breath and sense, reason and the body and the very inner self with life, which without him is powerless—of what use to me is a life without him? It would be vain. He of whose glory the whole triple world is the manifestation, on whom all depends and to whom all belongs, of what use is a life without him?—O Śrīvatsa, from the mouths of the masters have I learnt that, according to the teachings of Holy Writ, he alone is the goal, and that only towards possessing him should one aspire. ‘Verily, so it is’, has it been declared again and again. Whoever abandons him shall be called a fool: he is lamentable. But I cannot find the way to behold him.’ And so I am resolved to end my life.”

Śrīvatsa: “Just as with thee, O King, I too had determined to destroy my life unless I beheld the GREAT LORD. Then there spake to me the voice of one invisible:—‘Not of thine own will mayest thou abandon thy body, which was given to thee by the divine Law. Go rather to the hermitage of the two masters, N. and N., in my holy land. They will declare the way to thee. For gracious is God to the man whose heart is afflicted.’ And I was just preparing to set out when I heard people saying:—‘Vishnu-dharma intends to give up his life. Why should he do that?’ Then I came here to see thee, after I had heard this talk about thee. For we are both oppressed by the same grief. (Hear further, then, how it has fared with me.)”

“Many ways of salvation had I studied: but none had helped me to the knowledge of God. I was instructed by the ‘philosophers’ (the adherents of *Sāṅkhyā*), in the method

of distinguishing accurately the (twenty-four) *tattvas* (and the individual soul which also subsists). Thus I learned to know the (individual, inner) single self called the 'twenty-fifth'. But verily the 'twenty-sixth', the highest *Purusha* himself, who is higher than those individual single souls, I could not find: him who is the foundation of all this that is called Being or Non-being (Spirit and Nature). Then I pondered inwardly:—'This spiritual subject (proclaimed by the *sāṅkhyas*) is not active (in each individual);¹ and Nature is in itself soulless material. How then can this creation, which exists before our eyes, have come into being? But in its connection with Nature, the spirit has itself only a "natural" existence, and it is not free. Who then could be the "cause" of this Universe? For still less can causation be ascribed to Nature itself; verily it is soulless material and must itself depend upon the "Spirit", (as has been said). And since they are thus both unfree—that is, incapable of causation—no causal activity can be ascribed to either of them. Now if a cause may somehow spring from the connection between Nature and the "spirit", then I myself should be such a one. Must not I myself, then, be the cause of the Universe? (But that is absurd.) Now (according to the teaching of these philosophers) the spirit is known to be absolutely separated from Nature; and for such a one there exists no capacity whatever for causation. In all this, therefore, only a spirit can be discerned that certainly is free from Nature, but is still not a universal cause.'—Thus perplexed, for long I tormented myself."

"Then, because of my affliction, another teacher resorted to me.² (Kindly) he spake:—'Why dost thou grieve, and why dost thou let the lotus of thy countenance wither?'. I answered him:—'Because I can find no one in the whole world who can resolve my doubts.' "

¹ This is *Sāṅkhya* doctrine.

² He was a master of *Yoga*—a *siddha*.

The siddha: "I know what troubles thee, without thy telling me. For by virtue of *Yoga* discipline I am a *siddha*. Thou seekest for the higher capacities (of the spirit,¹ of which the *sāṅkhyas* could give thee nothing). As the blossom of the *palāśa* tree is not moistened by the water, so verily the spirit is not sullied by Nature (as the *sāṅkhyas* have rightly told thee). But only through *Yoga* does the spirit attain *siddhi*—that is, supernatural miraculous power. Hear now how it gains this: God Himself produces the movable and the immovable only by *Yoga* Power; only by *Yoga* does He sustain it and hold it together; all this, all that can be seen or heard, rests upon *Yoga* lordship. Now *Yoga*, to begin with, is the complete suppression of the functions of the organ of thought. Through *Yoga* power (arising from this) is attained omniscience, dominion over men, omnipresence, memory (of one's own previous existences), and in fact the Universe. There is no 'lord' higher than (the magical power of) *Yoga*. The 'nine treasures' are gained through *Yoga*, and also the eight supernatural *siddhis*. Only through their *Yoga* do the (celestial) *manes*, the *munis* (or *siddhas*) and the gods exist. By *Yoga* he who is established therein rises above the five elements, above primitive Matter, above the spirit, above all beings. So gain thou, by means of *Yoga*, possession of lordship over all. Then thou shalt become, by thy mere will, a creator of the entire Universe."

Srīvatsa: "So I turned, unwearied, to the *Yoga* system inculcated by this teacher; and by such *Yoga* paths, beginning with discipline, self-control and the like, I became a perfect *yogin*, untouched by pain and illness. By such *Yoga* I could see into the interior of all things; and my thus perfected self I deemed an unequalled lord. 'Different in

¹ From himself and his own interests the *siddha* infers those of his interlocutor; but he is wrong, since the other seeks something wholly different.

essence, in power and might, from all other beings (belonging, that is to say, to the quite different class of beings of the *siddhas*), I shall now by the sheer force of will perform miraculous works'—thus thought I. And so, by virtue of my will, high in the ether I created a divine, ravishing world, most glorious and wondrous to behold. On a great golden throne I sat and created planets, stars and lunar constellations, created for myself a lovely woman and children and comrades. Here whatever I desired became real. And I thought:—'There is no other Lord than I. I myself am the Creator: no other and no higher Creator is there than I myself, nor will there ever be one'. But after long time the decree of God, of the Supreme (by whose permission alone all those miraculous works had come into being), came to an end; and then my own magical will power vanished. The magic city had disappeared; in the far ethereal spaces I was *alone*. 'Who', I asked myself, 'has robbed me of my power that sprang from *Yoga*? Where dwells this Being? is it mightier still than *Yoga* lordship?'

• (In search of him) I penetrated into visible things, into the Earth and outside the Earth; taking the form of water, into the water; but the Highest Spirit I saw not. Out of the water I went, in the guise of fire into fire and far beyond: but the Highest Spirit I saw not. Likewise into the air, the ether, individuality and the great and mighty (*ahamkāra* and *mahat*), and into the primitive Matter itself; but the Highest Spirit I saw not. Above the realm of Nature I mounted into the sphere of the spiritual. But here I beheld only the self (of individual beings): the Highest Spirit I saw not. Then I thought:—'The Highest Spirit does not exist: therefore He does not show Himself. Nor in *Yoga* is there salvation nor knowledge, nor true power. Nevertheless our thought (Holy Writ, teachers and others) tell us that there is a Spirit higher than all spirits. Why then does He not let Himself be seen, as He is, in form,

being and attributes? The goal of the *yogin* and of all others (who strive after the transcendent) can be only this Highest Spirit itself, or the lordship (of the *siddhas*, of which I have spoken. But since both are vain), I must conclude that there is no way at all to the Highest (transcendent goal).”

“And as (full of despair) I thought thus, out of the air a voice spoke to me:—‘Only through devout love (that is, *Bhakti*), am I to be seen. Not otherwise, even by ten thousand means of salvation. The “Spirit” which (by way of *Sāṅkhya* or *Yoga*) thou hast found, through the knowledge transcending the *tattvas* of Nature, is certainly higher than “Nature”, but that too is nothing other than what depends on Me and belongs to Me. I alone am higher than Nature and Spirit. But I, in Myself, can be attained by no other path than through the love which is directed upon nought else but Me. Be thou led by the master (whom I shall show thee) to the loye which is wholly devoted to Me, and practise this. And abandon all other “means”, for by no other method of salvation am I to be attained.’”—

King Vishnu-dharma follows this instruction. He gives up his kingdom, family and possessions, leaves his country and betakes himself with Śrīvatsa to the master of whom he has been told, in order to win the “highest and keenest devout love” which will procure for him, not the imaginary good of the *yogin*, not the cold wisdom of “philosophers”, but bliss in the service of the deeply felt and sought for “Lord”.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUDING NOTES

(The Reference Numbers are to Chapters and Verses of
The Gītā)

ii. 9: Govinda means “the finder of cows”; and the word doubtless has the significance, in the first place, of a “seer” who, like Samuel, knew how to find and point out run-away or stolen cattle, together with the spirit that inspires him. Such a spirit, as the patron of cows, the *vrishnis* will have worshipped in addition to the *naras* and *nārāyanas* previously referred to. Then when Krishna himself became identified with Nārāyana, he himself too became Govinda. The myth that I have already quoted relates how the vanquished Indra humbles himself before Krishna and consecrates him as king by *abhisheka* (sprinkling, or baptism). At the same time, at this regal consecration, he thus addresses him:—

“I am Indra of the *devas*, but thou hast gained Indra’s power over the cows.

As Govinda the people will ever praise thee.

And because the cows have set thee as Indra (lord) and god over (*upari*) myself,

The deities in heaven will sing to thee as *Upa-Indra*.¹

(Here *upa* is derived from *upari* on the basis of an incorrect etymology.)

ii. 10: “These words”. To this there corresponds in x. 1:— “Now hear further My *supreme* utterance”. The former term constitutes the first reference to Arjuna’s “care” and “sorrow”, and as such it is only the introduction to the main subjects of Krishna’s discourse to Arjuna—“From Me everything arises”, and the truth that Arjuna is to be God’s “tool”.

ii. 11: In *The Kashmir Recension of The Bhagavadgītā*² Otto Schrader has shown that the most probable reading here is

¹ *Harivamśa*, 4004 ff.; cf. ante p. 240.

² P. 14; (Stuttgart, 1930; referred to throughout as *K*).

prajñavat na abhibhāshase—“thou dost not speak (to me) with insight”. If this is correct its sense becomes clear. Arjuna is oppressed by his *śoka* (sorrow) and, what is still more important, he lacks insight into what is to be accomplished on the battle-field—the fatal decree of the great God, and equally the rôle of Arjuna himself as “the tool” of Him “from Whom everything arises”. Then Krishna removes the *śoka* by the first portion of his speech, and Arjuna indicates this to him by acknowledging, after hearing his words, that “the perplexity has disappeared” (xviii. 73). Krishna gives him “insight” into the will of the God of Destiny by his self-manifestation as *Kāla*, and also by declaring:—“Be thou nought but My tool” (xi. 33). This verse gives, therefore, in the clearest and most concise way, as it were the programme for Krishna’s speech and his deed of revelation.

The *Vulgate* term—*prajñāvādān*—is a questionable and disputed construction. In my Translation I have attempted to derive some meaning from it, although I prefer the Kashmir reading. Madhva explains the expression *prajñāvādān* by *svamāniśottha-vacanāni* (words arising from one’s own intelligence), and his commentator adds:—“Words that originate only from thy own knowledge, not from the instruction of the writings and the masters”, the relation between *prajñā* (knowledge) and *vāda* (doctrine) is to be interpreted as that of cause to effect, the compound being a genitive *tatpurusha*. Now the poet was certainly not thinking of the contrast with the doctrines of writings or of masters, but may have intended to refer merely to human reflection and judgment, incapable as this is of insight into God’s eternal decrees.

II. 14-19, 21: On the rejection of this Gloss *cf.* pp. 145 *f.*

It is clear that *v. 20* is connected with *13*; and Garbe’s exclusion of *17* is unjustified, since *17* and *18* require each other and, *taken in conjunction*, they explain *16*. Further, in *18* *śarīrin* is in the singular, as is *tat* in *17*, while *tat* is not *Brahman* but the *ātma-tattvam* (*Rāmānuja*). But whether this is regarded here as singular or as plural cannot be decided from this passage; either is possible.

II. 23-28: This argument, springing from the spiritual attitude of a resigned agnosticism that is wholly foreign to the *ātman* doctrine, likewise occurs in the Sections of *Moksha-dharma*, 174, 17, which are congenial to Buddhism. It is obvious that it contrasts most violently with the confident assurance of

strophes 20, 22, 29, and that the writer of *v.* 29 cannot also have written 28. In the crassest possible way it completely separates strophes 22 and 29, closely connected together though these are.

II. 30: *quod erat demonstrandum*. Here a clear summary is given of the theme stated in 12, 13, and subsequently *substantiated* by the sacred words of authority of *vv.* 20, 22, 29. In this summary, however, there is not one word of the *Sāṅkhya* doctrine that the *ātman* itself is not active, nor a single reference to any part of the other material interpolated here.

II. 45: *nitya-satva-stha*: *sattva* is the first of the three *gunas*; as to the nature of the *gunas*, *The Gitā* itself provides detailed information in XIV. 5. In this verse Arjuna is called upon to stand *above* the *gunas*, and this would also mean above the *guna sattva*; at the same time, however, he is required to stand in the *nitya-satva*. Here there is opposed to the *ksharam*—that is to the *sattva* which pertains to whatever is “ephemeral”—a *sattva* that is not a *guna* of an ephemeral “nature”, but is the *nityam*—not fleeting but everlasting. This is, however, the real meaning of *sattvam* itself, while actually the use of the term *sattva* for a *guna* of “ephemeral” character is a self-contradiction. My own conjecture is that the position of *sattva* among the Nature *gunas* here is not original, but that in contrast to *rajas* and *tamas*, *sattva* at one time denoted the actual ideal, and that this subsequently rendered it imperative to distinguish, from *sattva* as a *guna*, a *nitya-satva* that was not a *guna* at all. Thus it corresponds to the sixth *Prapāthaka* of *The Chāndogya*, from which, in fact, the *guna* doctrine no doubt originates. Here “SAT” is not one of the *vikāras*—not one of the later-born constituents of created Nature—but that which precedes all Nature and forms its foundation. And to this the ancient doctrine of the three *gunas* evidently refers in Treatise III, (*The Gitā*, XVII. 26), which again is *not Sāṅkhya*. In accordance with the inculcation of Equanimity-Yoga in general, *nitya-satva* here becomes *moralized*, denoting in the first instance the firm and constant spiritual attitude of inner freedom and superiority which is based on the *vyavasāya* of II. 45. The latter, nevertheless, always remains metaphysically overshadowed. It is the prelude to a transcendent condition, never more clearly defined, but which can be indicated by *Nirvāna*, *Brahma-Nirvāna*, *Brāhmī sthitis*, *Brahma-Bhāva*, *siddhi*, *samsiddhi*, *siddhatva*, or other symbols of transcendence.

II. 46: I believe that Otto Schrader's ingenious explanation of this verse is inaccurate, because it implies that the "brahman" is not "wise" but *stupid*. Here, rather, the activity of the Brahmanic-Vedic cult, as directed to individual "profit", is evidently referred to, so that in the following verse the renunciation of "profit" may be opposed to it; only this interpolation accords with the vigorous rejection in *vv. 42-45*

II. 50: *Karma-bhanda*, or the fetters due to *Karman*, is that which results from action in general, both bad and good alike. Or in other terms, *Yoga* deprives action of its *dangerous* character (similarly with Śankara). The translation: "Yoga gives skill with regard to actions", is seriously misleading and wholly opposed to the true sense of the context. Enquiries about someone's *kauśalam* refer to his good health, not to his possession of skill; and in this connection, *kauśalam* corresponds to "the abode *free from sickness*" of *v. 51*. It is by no means the *yogin's* purpose to exalt action and its accomplishment, nor to show how proficiency therein is acquired. Rather he intends to indicate how, with respect to the action which is in fact unavoidable, the *danger* is to be averted of being stricken by the fatality which always attends all action, *as such*. Of Fichte's "joyous doing of the 'right'", as of his "vocation of man for joyously active work", and again of Nietzsche's "manifestation of power", this Hindu Ethics knows absolutely nothing and would never have comprehended it.

II. 52: *Śrotavyasya śrutasya ca*: this onomatopoeic alliteration is intended as an ironical reference to the continual chatter made by the brahmans reciting their *Texts*, with which, as the *Śuka* legend mockingly says, they "fill the world"; cf. "the endless chatter of the brahmans" in *Sanatsujātaparvan*, 42, 6.¹

II. 66: A *bhāvita* is a man of cultivated, developed and disciplined character, and the term has been employed previously in II. 34 in the sense of "honourable". I would suggest that in this passage the word *bhāvanā*,² about which there has been much controversy, is to be understood in accordance with this derivation. According to *Petersburger Wörterbuch*, *bhāvita-buddhi* means one who has *cultivated* his understanding, and in this verse *buddhi* is closely connected with *bhāvanā*. I have already discussed the meaning of *Buddhi-Yoga* in this

¹ Deussen, p. 11.

² cf. Chapter VII, p. 239.

Treatise¹—the “cultivation” of *buddhi* until it acquires the steadfast form of steeled and immutable force of resolution, based on the fundamental *vyavasāya* of v. 45. Thus interpreted, however, *bhāvanā* actually approaches very closely to “character” (in its Kantian sense). For “character” is in itself precisely the permanent development of *buddhi* by means of maxims; and for our *yogin* this is the state of mind which actually accompanies *sānti*, or inner spiritual serenity, which is for him at the same time the condition of genuine “happiness”.

III. 3: This is inaccurate, and is moreover a slight modification of the sense of *buddhi*. In the preceding passages the *essential* point was, in the first place, that *if* we act, we should do so without attachment, but not as yet that we *should* act; this is deferred to a later stage. And *buddhi*, which hitherto has been the “practical wisdom” of firm resolution, is here equated to the theoretical *jñāna* of the *sāṅkhyas*. The dual significance of *buddhi*, as force of resolution and also as knowledge, here facilitates this extension of its meaning, while the author’s own standpoint, in desiring to be at one and the same moment both *sāṅkhya* and *yogin*, demands it.

III. 4: The condition of the *siddha*. The *siddhas* were at one time perfected *yogins* who had attained the magical *aiśvaryam* (lordship)—deified magical beings, powerful and blessed.² For their mode of being our author subsequently employs the expression *brahmī sthitih*—the Brahmic transcendent and miraculous state of perfection—and also *Brahma-Nirvāna*, which for him has the same meaning.

III 9–18: This Section is quite clearly recognizable as a Brahmanic Gloss, if only because in its ultimate tendency it stands in the sharpest contrast to the doctrines of the author of the Treatise himself. For he never regarded “action” as being specifically sacrificial action, and his express teaching is that by no means sacrificial action only, but *all* actions, do not bind their doer when they are performed without attachment to action and its fruits; and, above all else, that it is precisely he who aspires to perfection who must perform actions: The Glossographer, however, intended to correct this doctrine in the totally different sense that only sacrificial action does not bind; and what is still more important, as against the writer of the

¹ Chapter VI, p. 228.

² cf. p. 122

Treatise he specifically defends that very *Sannyāsa* ideal which the latter most emphatically combats. For in vv. 17 and 18 he teaches, in accordance with the genuine Brahmanic ideal, that he who is perfect *acts no more*, but follows the path of full and actual *nirvritti*, passing on from Matter to Spirit. As contrasted with the ideal of Equanimity-Yoga, both standpoints alike are true scholastic Brahmanism. On the one hand it defends on subtle grounds the way of Vedic sacrifice, while for the same reasons, on the other hand, it extols the ideal of the *Parivrājaka* —an ancient religious community. Śankara quite rightly utilizes this passage in pursuing his well-known method of completely inverting the doctrine of action in *The Gītā*; and with equal justice he refers also to the *Brihad-Āranyaka Upani-shad*, III. 5, 1,—the *locus classicus* for the ancient *Parivrājaka* ideal that disavows action.¹

This Gloss is very clearly presented:—

(1). The two reasons for the duty, never to be neglected, of sacrificial action:

(a). He who does not sacrifice robs the gods. 9-13.

(b). He who does not sacrifice contemns *Brahman* itself and hinders the *Brahman* wheel: 14-16.

(2). The ideal of the *sannyāsin*, who no longer acts, which is superior to that of the sacrificer (*yajamāna*): 17, 18.

Further as regards (1, b), v. 14 traces “the beings”, in the first place, back to the sacrifice; they rest on its (magical) operation—that is to say, they are supported by this. Then, says v. 15:—“*Brahman* itself, so far as it is all pervading (*sarvagatam*), rests always on the sacrifice”. Plainly each is intended to supplement the other, as they actually do if *sarvagatam* is taken literally here. Thus from *Brahman*, in its form as undeveloped *Aksharam* (eternal or imperishable), is distinguished *Brahman* as *sarvagatam*: *Brahman*, in other terms, no longer as transcendent and undeveloped but as “having become the All”—that is as having become all beings. Since all “beings” are supported by the sacrifice, and since they also are *Brahman* as *sarvagatam*, it is therefore true that *Brahman* itself, precisely as *sarvagatam*, is sustained by the sacrifice too, whence it follows that whoever despises the sacrifice despises *Brahman* also. He does this, moreover, in so far as sacrifice reposes on general

¹ cf. vi. 1.

Veda action, this again on *Veda* *śabdabrahman*, and this in turn on the Highest *Brahman*—on *Aksharam*.

Such a person, at the same time, interferes with the spokes of a mighty *wheel*. Certainly the course of the line just delineated was traced backwards from the *bhūtāni* (the existent beings) to *Aksharam*: both these, however, are *Brahman*: and thus the line goes from *Brahman* to *Brahman*: it is a circle; and with this figure of the circle is associated that of the wheel—of the World-wheel, and finally the continued rotation, or else the retardation, of the wheel. This seems to me to be the most probable sense of this verse, even though it conflicts with the *Commentaries*; and if *vv. 14b-15a* followed *15b*, it would be obvious. But in this order the concatenation requisite to introduce the image of the circle would be interrupted.

The author of the Gloss forcibly inserts this between *vv. 8* and *19*, although these are as closely associated as are the two shells of one nut. He wishes to immunize *v. 8*, and with this to provide a prophylactic antidote to *vv. 19ff.* This Gloss again, which is undoubtedly interpolated, yields in its unmistakable signature a good method of identifying its writer in other passages; and the same hand, pursuing the same tendency, has composed the circumstantial sacrificial theory in the interpolation IV. 24-32, where he once more confuses the context and diverges from the actual trend of the author himself.¹ He even repeats (and this as an entering in to *Brahman*!) the “food as the remains of the sacrifice”—the last feature that would ever have occurred to the mind of our *Karma-yogin*. Here too we find his assertion that the sacrifice rests upon (Vedic) action; and he converts the “knowledge” extolled by the *Sāṅkhya-Yoga* author into the knowledge that all “sacrifice”, or in other words all religious practices and methods, originate in Vedic action.

III. 15: Śridhara explains *Karman* and *Brahman* as *yajamānādi-vyāpāra-rūpam karma; brahma vedah; karma tasmāt pravrīttam*; and thus, unquestionably, it is to be understood.

As regards the beginning of the series in *v. 14*: “the beings” are the *sarvagatam Brahman*. Since “the beings” are sustained by the sacrifice, *Brahman* itself—that is as *sarvagatam*—is supported by the sacrifice. He who is reluctant to offer, therefore, retards the very progress of *Brahman*.

¹ cf. Chapter vi, p. 231.

III. 29: The dual distinction between the *ātman* and the *gunas* on the one hand, and the *karmāṇi* (works) on the other, according to Śridhara.

Metaphysically, God “dwells” in all beings; here, however, we are concerned with the specific indwelling *by grace*; and this contrast pertains to developed *Bhakti* theology:—

“The host of creatures, O King, is connected with Vishnu in two ways,

In general, on the one hand, and again in particular.

In general, all that lives and moves is united with him,

In so far as it originally sprang from him and now finds life through him.

No doubt this *unites* to him, but the bond is insufficient to bestow salvation,

And to free from the fetters of *samsāra*. For this there must exist a *better* unity.

This is the second mode, which I indicated to thee as the ‘particular’.”¹

III. 33-43: With *vv.* 30-32 the doctrine hitherto expounded had reached a definite conclusion. It appears to me that, originally, *iv. 1 ff.* immediately followed these verses, *iv. 1* obviously resumes “this My teaching” as from III. 32, so that the intervening Section is a digression. In any case we must say of *vv.* 33-35 what, according to Schrader,² Abhinavagupta asserts in another connection—*atra kecid asambaddhāḥ ślokāḥ kalpitāḥ*:—“here some unconnected verses have been composed”; for *v. 33* has not the remotest reference to what precedes, while it contradicts all the essential implications of Character-Yoga, since this is certainly not resigned when confronted by “Nature”, but demands that it be overcome and presupposes that this can be done. Similarly *v. 34* is antithetic to *v. 33*, because the former inculcates fighting the “enemy”; *v. 35*, again, is completely unconnected (*asambaddha*). It appears to me, therefore, that these three verses are disconnected Notes that have invaded the *Text* from the margin.

III. 34: *cf. Sanatsujatāparvan*, 42, 17 *ff.*: “lurks around men, spying out their weak points, as the hunter stalks the game”.³

IV. 6: In view of its intentionally paradoxical character, this

¹ *cf.* my *Vishnu-Nārāyaṇa*, p. 43.

² *op. cit.*, p. 8.

³ Deussen, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

verse must perhaps be given a still more pointed expression. "Though I am *unborn* and *unchanging*, the *Lord* of 'those who have come into existence' (and therefore Myself absolutely distinct from all that has come into existence)—I *become*." That He Who exists beyond all becoming and changing should Himself enter into becoming is an impossibility, and contradicts His "Nature" as that of Him Who has not become, of the unchangeable, of the Lord above and beyond all that has become. But God "is superior" to (*adhishtāya*) His own "Nature" and is not subjected to it, while His *Māyā* is "the capacity to render the impossible actual". Thus He can condition His own Nature (*svām prakritim adhishtāya*), and by His own *Māyā* (*ātmamāyā*) enter into becoming.

This verse is therefore not at all "docetic", as has been suggested; and the becoming of the One Who has not become is not "mere *Māyā*" in the sense of "mere appearance", but is wholly realistically intended in the sense of an actual miracle of *Yoga-Māyā*, quite correctly identified by some commentators with the *sva-icchā*—the "free Will"—of God, Who is not bound even by the predicate of the Absoluteness of His own "Nature".

Śrīdhara, himself a monist, here explains *prakritim adhishtāya* as "free from subservience to *Karma*" (*karma-pāratantryarahita*), while for him *Māyā* is by no means merely apparent activity but "capacity, consisting in unerring knowledge, strength, power, etc." connected with one's own free volitional resolution. Elsewhere he calls it "the supernatural and wholly incomprehensible *śakti* of the Supreme Lord".

IV. 10: *madbhāvam*: this does not mean that "they are annihilated in Me", but that "they attain the same supernatural mode of Being that I too possess". Śrīdhara, again as a monist, also expounds *madbhāvam* in terms of *mat-sāyujyam*—union as community.

IV. 11: This expresses my own impression; according to Śrīdhara, *varma* is equivalent to *mama bhajana-mārgam*—the way of worshipping Me.

IV. 13: The sense of the context 11-14 is:—"I *impart* eternally to the whole Universe, I *create* the world of the four castes, and in so doing I have regard to both *gunas* and *Karman*. Therefore I am ever active. And nevertheless am I a 'non-worker'."

IV. 23: With this cf. IV. 10—*jñāna-tapas*. In accordance with this, here too in this passage it is a question of the *jñāna-yajña*,

as *v.* 33 also proves. It is not at all concerned with offering "action" as sacrifice, but of employing *jñāna* as *yajña*:—cf. *jñāna-yajñas* in *v.* 28; *yajña* is then not so much "sacrifice", regarded as an offering to the gods, but has the ancient sense of a magical act of power, like *tapas*, *yajña* is a capacity for magical effects

The author of this Treatise is both *sāṅkhyā* and *yogin*, and his *sāṅkhyā* aspect is once more proclaimed by this accentuation of *jñāna*.

IV 25: *yajñena eva*: here what is instrumental, as so frequently happens, assumes the meaning of "as". Certainly these people do not sacrifice raw offerings, nor only to the lower *devas*, but sacrifice with the correct ritual in the "Brahman fire", nevertheless they perform their sacrifice "only as" a *yajña*, that is to say without at the same time transforming the sacrificial act into meditative *Brahman* mysticism, as brahmans do. Thus they fail to do what *v.* 24 demands—to contemplate the act of sacrifice itself as *Brahman*.

The *Śāndilya Samhitā*, *v.* 2, 18, runs as follows:—"In the beginning of the second World era the threefold *Veda* appeared, and (in consequence of this) it was provided with the sacrificial fire. But in primitive times 'yajñena yajñam ayajan'"; which here means: "The sacrifice was performed 'simply as a sacrifice', but without doing this in the ritual form of the fire offering"; here too, then, what is instrumental takes the form of "as".

IV 26: Moral-ascetic allegorizing of the idea of sacrifice.

IV. 26b: The sense is obscure. In view of the graduated series, something profounder than what precedes must here be implied. The *Anugītā*, 20, 23, may provide some illumination, where objects are subjectively produced, then cast into the "sacrificial fire" of perception, and by this method projected into the outer world. Is it possible that the present passage means the reverse of all this?—that the objects are burnt, while they are at the same moment meditatively recognized as being mere subjective products of sense imagery?

IV. 30: The experts in hungering and the fasting ascetics, who by their fast lower their own vitality, and finally go so far as to lose their lives by deliberately fasting to death. But why *prāneshu*? has this been inserted merely from delight in mystically sounding words?

IV. 32: Earlier, in III. 14, 15, says the same Glossographer:—

"the sacrifice is produced by (ritual) action, (ritual) action from the *Vedas*, the *Vedas* from *Aksharam Brahman*".

With respect to sacrifice, this Brahmanic theologian first of all regards all religious practices as "yajñas" and then asserts that, as such, they are all to be derived from Vedic ritual "action". And for him the redeeming knowledge is—Brahmanic orthodoxy about sacrifice! His philosophy of sacrifice depends on the allegorizing of *jñāna* as a magically powerful *yajña*, and he attempts to reinterpret the *jñāna* of the *sāṅkhyā-yogin ad maiorem gloriam* of his *Brahman*, his *Veda* and the Vedic sacrifice wisdom, which the writer of this Treatise himself, however, had rejected as "flowery" priestly learning.

v. Treatise V. This is a supplement to VII, which reached its clearly defined conclusion in iv. 42. Its Theme is to be found in vv. 1-6. "Sāṅkhyā and Yoga are connected together", as the obvious supplementary justification of the standpoint actually assumed by the writer of the previous Treatise. There follows the proof of the Theme by drawing parallels between the positions held by *sāṅkhyā* and *yogin* respectively:—

(i): The first comparison.

- (a). The *sāṅkhyā*'s attitude, 8, 9.
- (b). That of the *yogin*, 11, 12.

(ii): The second comparison.

- (a). The attitude of the *sāṅkhyā*, 13-17.
- (b). And of the *yogin*, 23, 27-29.

v. 1: The term *Karma-Yoga* has a double meaning:—in the more general sense of *Yoga*, as exercise or practice, it may denote simply the practice of works in general; this, quite naturally, Krishna does not praise, but extols the doing of works as a *yogin*. In this its strict implication *Karma-Yoga* is the *Yoga* which, as distinct from the intellectual procedure of the *sāṅkhyā*, entails the *Nirvikāram Karma* of technical *Yoga* discipline together with severe schooling of the will, and which (on the other hand) authenticates the latter in and by accomplishing works

v. 2: Here the *sannyāsin* of the ordinary type continues to be tolerantly admitted as being on the path to salvation; but the next Treatise unmistakably corrects this tolerance as excessive.

v. 19: Or "Has already gained the whole world".

VI-IX:

Treatise VI: *Bhakti* Theology, associated with *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga* as the subordinate stage.

(A). The Subordinate Stage: VI.

- (1). Editorial connection with Treatise V Genuine *Sannyāsa* in *Yoga*. 1-9.
- (2). The systematic discipline of technical *Yoga*: 10-22.
- (3). Helpful factors towards *Yoga*: 23-36, omitting 27-32.
- (4). Specific questions by the *Yoga* disciple 37-46.

(B). The Higher Stage: *Bhakti* Theology as developing *Viśish-tādvaita*: VI. 47-IX.

- (1). Correct knowledge: VII. 1-14.
- (2). He who knows truly, and he who does not know: 15-30.
- (3). Eschatology.
 - (a). Individual eschatology: VIII. 5-16.
 - (b). Cosmic eschatology and the transcosmic realm of salvation: 17-21.
 - (c). Conclusion of (a) and (b): 22.
- (4). God's Freedom from the Law of *Karman*: IX. 7-9.
- (5). The Relations between *Bhakti* faith, unbelief, and partial belief. 10-25
- (6). Praise of *Bhakti* religion, which imparts blessedness: 26-34.

VI. 3: This Gloss completely inverts the sense of this Treatise by obviously seeking to save the old *Sannyāsa* ideal and patch it up. It has in view the stage of the *Parivrajaka*, a religious community which, even more than *Yoga*, abandons all action and by no means only interest in action and reward. In order to adapt itself to, and immunize in advance, the approaching term *Yogarūḍha*, it introduces the distinction between desiring to rise and having risen (*āruruksu* and *ārūḍha*), and asserts that only he who ascends acts, but that he who has already ascended acts no more.

VI. 6: Or *śatruye (sati)*: "since there exists enmity on the part of the not-self (against the self), let the self behave as the enemy (of the not-self)".

VI. 7: Here, as the second line of the stanza plainly shows, *samāhita* (concentrated) should be divided into *sama-āhita*— "firmly directed to equality". cf. *Petersburger Wörterbuch*, *ādhā* 1,

“to direct to something”. This verse, therefore, is not “in a hopeless condition”, as Otto Schrader believes, but is perfectly clear. For whenever one has overcome the self, or in other words his senses, and is therefore in the psychical state of the equilibrium of *sānti*, then, as has already been explained a hundred times, one is *sama-āhita* with regard to the “pairs” (to which the second half of the verse refers), that is to say, focused upon equanimity and firmly directed thereto: *parama-ātman* (the highest *ātman*) becomes clear also. He who overcomes body, senses and the play of thought conquers “himself” too; but the self that subdues “itself” is vastly different from the “self” to be subjugated, and is far *sublimer* (*parama*); cf. v. 5. In this connection *parama-ātman* is simply equivalent to *adhyātman*—*lātman par préférence*—“the essential self” or (as it is generally translated) the *real* self as contrasted with the bodily, sensuous or merely psychical self.

VI. 15: *Matsamtha* means not “dependent on Me” but “abiding in Me”. The *Isvara* of *Sa-Isvara-Yoga*, properly speaking, is not the bestower of peace of soul, but exists therein as the “Supreme Spirit” eternally freed from *Karman*, and as eternally satisfied (*āptakāma*) also eternally at “peace”. The *yogin*, too, attains *similar* peace. In the first place, then, this term does not as yet transcend the frontiers of mere *Sa-Isvara-Yoga*, and must not, thus far, be understood as *Bhakti* theology. With this vv. 20, 21, are in complete agreement: here the goal of *Yoga* is not joy in the Lord, and in community with Him, but the blessedness of the self in itself. Here too the end is only the *Kaivalyam* (isolation from the world), although at the same time the *Kaivalyam* of the *yogin* is positive bliss, while that of the *sāṅkhyas* is merely the absence of pain. In this connection, also, this goal of absoluteness is, quite as a matter of course, called *Nirvāna*.

VI. 20-22: I have employed demonstratives in order to clarify, to some extent, the tumultuous and intertwined relatives of this dithyrambically agitated glorification of the happiness of *Yoga*, ending in a semi-anacolouthop. The longer portion closes with an elegant play of words on *Yoga*, as equivalent to “conjunction”, which cannot be at all adequately rendered in any European language.

VI. 32: Perhaps *ātma-aupamyena* means “equanimity within oneself”, in the sense of “remaining always like oneself”, or (in

different terms) not permitting one's temperamental attitude to be changed by either pain or pleasure. Thus the translation should run:—"He who, remaining always like himself, perceives one and the same in joy and woe, must be esteemed as the greatest of all *yogins*". In that case, only the *yogin*'s general mood of equanimity would be praised. But in view of the preceding pretentious verses, this would be a veritable anti-climax. Śridhara's alternative interpretation is doubtless correct: he takes *ātma-aupamya* to mean "equality of others with oneself", and adds—"Among all the *yogins* who worship Me" (to whom *v.* 31 had referred) "I look upon him as foremost who is benevolently inclined to all beings. For it follows from the equality of everyone with all others that as I value and experience well-being and love, sorrow and pain, so too do all others. He who, thus perceiving the equality that subsists between all, desires only love to all (just as he desires love to himself) but ill to none, him I (God) esteem most highly." This would be precisely the *regula aurea Christi* in its positive form, except that He speaks of doing and not merely of wishing; cf. *The Anugītā*, 19, 3, "He who treats all beings as himself. . . ."¹

It is clear that, in this Gloss, the "infinite happiness" of mere *Yoga-Kaivalyam* in *v.* 21 is to be reinterpreted in the sense of *Advaita*. But here it is a matter of a peculiar type of *Advaita*, which I have previously discussed.² It is theistic *Advaita*, penetrated by *Bhakti*, which emphatically protests (in *v.* 30) against "being lost", that is to say against submergence into an impersonal *Brahman* and an impersonal *Brahma-Nirvāna*; *vv.* 29-32 are probably the most beautiful in the entire *Gītā*.

Nevertheless it is equally obvious that this Section (27-32) is only a Gloss. For the systematic writer of the Treatise does not introduce his passage, outbidding mere *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, until Chapter VII, where it is specifically and fully presented at its close after he has first of all discussed special problems concerning *Yoga* itself. He would not have anticipated himself in any way that so deeply perturbs his own arrangement of the material. Finally, *v.* 33 is too obviously connected with *v.* 26.

VI. 46: The *jñānins*:—the *sāṅkhyas*, that is to say. This is a *polemic* against the previous Treatise; as contrasted with the earlier author, this writer *declines* to associate *Sāṅkhya* with

¹ Deussen, p. 898.

² P. 166.

Yoga. In this instance, therefore, the *yogin* is exalted above the three groups of penitents, philosophers and sacrificers, while again, in v. 47, the *bhakta* is ranked higher than the *yogin*.

VII. 1: While the mere *Sa-Īśvara-yogin* certainly possesses knowledge of God, only in *Bhakti* religion is this knowledge possessed "without doubt and entirely". At this point the writer of the Treatise is evidently about to begin a new and higher phase, which he delimits as against what has already been expounded.

VII. 3: "For *Suddhi*":—that is for the stage of perfection such as *Yoga* already knows of and mediates

VII. 4: God's lower Nature is distinguished from His Higher; the latter is "the *jīva*", embracing the psychic-spiritual in the Universe (conceived as an infinite number of individual psychic-spiritual subjects). Penetrated and animated by Him is the "lower" Nature also, the realm of the "material" or, still better, the "apathetic" or the "dull", although to this "apathy" pertain factors which we should not attribute to the "material", such as *indriyas*, *manas* and *buddhi*. These however are "dull" or "torpid" because, in accordance with Hindu Psychology, the senses, understanding and reason effect nothing more than contact with their objects, apperception proper, on the other hand, results only when the *jñāna* of the spiritual subject "illuminates" them.¹ To these belongs also the *ahamkāra*—the "maker of the *ego*"; and my own translation of this term as "individuality" or "the thought of I" is a mere makeshift, since this *ahamkāra* is by no means the *ego* itself, nor does it imply that God, or the soul, is not an "I"; *ahamkāra* is that principle by virtue of which the spiritual *ego* relates objects to itself, especially the body that is connected with it, in this way attributing them "to itself" and saying "I" and "my" with reference to them. More specifically, it is the (spurious) identification of the body, thus "personified", with the spiritual subject, as such.

This factor of appropriation "to the *ego*" is regarded, together with the senses, understanding and reason, as an independent factor and organ. For the present author, as also in the doctrine of mature philosophical qualified *Mēnism* (*Viśiṣṭādvaīla*), *jīva* is identical with the *ātman*; it is the possessor of *jñāna* and, at the same moment, the vital principle in all that is bodily.

¹ cf. p. 300 on XIII 33.

vii. 6, 7: This God of personal *Bhakti* is in every respect a Universal God also, or in other words the God Who includes the Universe within Himself, projects it from, and resumes it within, Himself, that is from, and into, His own "Nature". God and Universe, however, are not identical—they are One not analytically but synthetically; cf p 14

vii 8-11: This again is a Gloss it maintains something wholly different from the *Text* itself. For this means the God Who, by virtue of His Nature, is "all in all", while the Gloss accords with the standpoint of Treatise VIII, which asserts not that God is everything universally but that, by means of specific hypostases (*vibhūtis*), He is the *optimum* in things and in all classes of things, and this presupposes a totally different point of view. The true sense of *v. 7* of the *Text* itself is much more clearly resumed in *v. 12*, where by no means only the *optimum*, which could indeed be only *sattvam*, but also and equally *rajas* and *tamas*, is involved, in His *Māyā*—that is in His creative Power.

vii 10: As the superiority of what is superior?

vii. 12: Here *bhāva* must imply "Being", otherwise 12b loses all meaning.

vii. 13. The *gunas* are what we should call "constituents, or factors, of Nature". The purblind world sees the play of Nature's constituents, but it does not perceive the divine player of this *guna*-play; it lets itself be "deceived".

vii 14: My *Māyā*. As I have already observed, Garbe translated this as "the Universe that appears", or "the apparent Universe", in the sense of some illusion¹. But here, on the contrary, *Māyā* is God's creative and miraculous Power. If the mind, with its feeble vision, permits itself to be deluded, then *Māyā* is indubitably a "deceiver", since it appears under the veil of the *gunas*. For even while God sets the play of the *gunas* into operation, He also conceals Himself behind it; and thus for him who is "deluded" Nature becomes a *larva Dei*. In this sense the doctrine of God as *Māyin*, and of *Māyā* as the deceiver, is valid from even the realistic-theistic point of view; cf. *Nārada-pāncarātra*, II. 1, 22:—

"One only is the Lord always, in all and in each. All (beings) have come into existence by His action but they are deceived by His *Māyā*."

¹ P. 216.

This is a massive Realism, and yet the *Māyā* is a “deceiver”. Still clearer is *v* 35b-36:—

“The *Vishnu-Māyā*, the eternal, the sublime, impersonates (divine) reason and embraces in its Being all (divine) powers. It is difficult to apprehend, (for) through it all are *deceived*—except Krishna’s *bhaktas*.¹”

Māyā becomes deceptive mainly through *ahamkāra*—because man regards the body as being his own self, or considers created things as his own and then directs his senses to them as objects of enjoyment. If the body and the things of sense are conceived thus, then they are “*Māyā*”, as is the hay crop that is swiftly over—worthless, fraud, deception. So again *The Brihadbrahma Samhitā*, 3, 35:—

“If a soul, being what is veiled by the curtain of *Māyā*, because of *ahamkāra* is an enjoyer of *Māyā* things, instead of seeking its salvation in God: if it is stricken by the arrows of *Māyā*, is without God and directs itself towards *Māyā*: if, forgetful of its *Brahman* nature, it becomes entangled in the three ‘snares’, becomes defiled and so participates in evil: then, although it originally shares My Being, it must suffer in *samsāra*. But if it realizes that the whole Universe, both spiritual and non-spiritual, and what is compounded from these, exists in *Brahman*, and so has its Being in Me alone, as in the (Highest) Self, then it overcomes the darkness of ignorance, attains My own Being and comes to Me, since it takes its refuge in Me alone (instead of in the creature). Such a one hews apart the *Māyā* consisting of the three (Nature-) *gunas*, ascends the path of the ray, etc., and attains the state of the (supermundane) *sattva-guna*—that is of *Suddha-sattvam*, which is also the *Bhāvā* of God.”¹

VII. 15: The “deception” is based on the fact that God is concealed behind the apparently independent play of the *gunas*; nevertheless it arises just because men, owing to “an *asuric* (diabolical) nature”, permit themselves to be deprived of the capacity to see beyond this *guna* play. The “*asuric* nature” is constituted by everything which is contrary to good conduct (*sad-ācāra*), but especially and always the *ahamkāra* with respect to the body and the enjoyment connected therewith; cf. once more *The Brihadbrahma Samhitā*, 3, 9:—

¹ cf. pp. 73, 180, 221.

"He who imagines that 'I am the body' falls a prey to *Māyā*. Seven veils has *Māyā*, which constitutes this World-egg (the Universe); and with these it embraces him who postulates *ahamkāra* with regard to his body. But whoever is free from this identification of himself with his body (and its carnal interests), and whoever realizes himself as belonging to *Brahman*, attains to *Brahman*."

vii. 19. "Vāsudeva is all": for the theistic *Bhakti* theologian this is in fact the highest formula. God "is" everything. But this in no sense implies that Universe and God are interchangeable ideas. *The Brihadbrahma Samhitā*, which is strictly personalistic, gives the following very subtle definition in 2, 25:—*sarvam eva aham evam ca; na ca aham aham eva ca*:—"I am both all things and I am not I". God says—"I am not merely I" (but at the same time I include in My Being the Being of the Universe). It immediately adds:—

"In so far as, and because, the Universe has its foundation in Me alone, I am, as the One Who has no second, the Highest; precisely because the Universe has its place solely in Me, I am everything"

So too as regards the relation of the individual soul to God. When (in 4, 26) the soul has reached the highest throne, God asks it.—

"Who art thou then?"

In quite orthodox terms the soul replies:—

"*Brahma asmi*":—"I am *Brahman*."

"Then how canst thou be *Brahman*, since thou art after all but a *sēsha*—a remnant, a worthless thing?"

It answers again:—

"I am a *predicate*; thou art he who bears and sustains me as predicate."

This *Brahman* existence is still further explained:—

"Without thee I could not exist in any way; thou art my preserver, my patron, my impeller, who givest me all my understanding. Therefore am I *Brahman*—I am nought whatsoever in myself."

And this *Brahman* existence culminates thus:—

"Thine am I, thine am I, thine am I (and nothing more); this is ever true."

This means that the knowledge that one is *Brahman* is identical with the realization that oneself is nothing at all, but that God

is all in all. It is a consciousness of *humility* towards God, Who is everything, and is myself also, and Who alone truly is. So too in the formula:—"Vāsudeva is all."

ix. 8: "Directing My own Nature", Śrīdhara

ix. ii: Here the sense is the same as in vii. 24. *avyaktam vyaktim āpannam*: "the imperceptible having become perceptible."

x. 9: This Gloss presupposes an already fully developed social life of the *bhakta* sect, together with the customs peculiar to it and the intimate mutual intercourse between the faithful that is emphasized here as one means of salvation. The community itself, still further, becomes a "church", and life in this church a necessary condition for salvation. With reference to this we find in *Nārada Pāñcarātra*, II. 2, 2 ff. —

"It is the *sangha* (the community) of the Krishna-*bhaktas* that, in the first place, makes *Bhakti* perfect. As the tender shoots of trees and shrubs sprout in the rain showers but dry up in the sun's heat, even so do new branches grow on the tree of *Bhakti* owing to the intercourse of the *bhaktis* and wither through dealings with non-*bhaktas*. Hence the prudent man always cultivates the society of *bhaktas*, but avoids communication with non-*bhaktas* as he eschews the snake."

xi. 17: The bearer of the crown, mace and discus is. Krislina, always in his *human* form, but these expressions do not denote God as seen in His *supernatural* manifestation. As in Arjuna's words.—"He who is known to me as the bearer of the crown, the mace and the discus, I now perceive in wholly different guise, that is suddenly, like a colossal light" (out of which, evidently, the spectacle described in vv. 19 ff. gradually develops). At the same time, however, v. 17 depicts the *natural* beginning of Arjuna's experience—the vanishing of the crown-, mace- and discus-bearer behind the newly emerging form of the Lord (*rūpam aiśvaram*); and in that case vv. 13, 15 and 16 are inapposite, and presumably a Gloss, while v. 16 clearly *anticipates* vv. 19 and 23. The latter, nevertheless, occupy their rightful position within a consistent account, which vv. 15 and 16. fail to do.

xii. 6: Here *dhyāyantas* certainly means not "to meditate" in the technical sense, but "to bear piously in mind"; cf. *Nārada Pāñcarātra*, I. 2, 36:—"The *vaishnavas* keep Krishna in mind, as Krishna also keeps the *vaishnavas* in his mind". Parallel with

this is the preceding line:—"Krishna's *prāna* (life) is directed to his *bhaktas*, as the *bhaktas'* *prāna* is directed to Krishna. Krishna 'lives' in his *bhaktas*, and the 'bhaktas' 'live' in Krishna".¹ Both expressions are synonymous with intimate reciprocity based upon *Bhakti*. This meaning of *dhyāna* recurs in the controverted *v.* 12: such *dhyāna* is just the "devout mind" which is "more excellent" than all lofty *jñāna* and all irksome technique (*abhyāsa*); while from a pious attitude of this kind there easily follows the renunciation (otherwise so difficult) of all the fruit of action, as *v.* 12 teaches. Similarly in *Nārada Pāñcarātra*, I. 3, 39, *dhyāyate* is synonymous with *bhajate*.

XII. 9: cf. *Brihadbrahma Samhitā*, 3, 6: *yoga-abhyāsa-prabhā-vatas*, by virtue of *Yoga* discipline.

XII. 10 ff.: Abhinavagupta confirms my own interpretation of this passage as a Treatise on *Prapatti*:—(1). He regards *mathkar-māni* as equivalent to *bhagavatkarmani* as *pūjā, japa, svādhyāya, homa, etc.*:—worship, muttering prayers, private study and oblations.

(2). If this is too difficult for anyone, because he is a layman and uneducated—"because he is ignorant of what the canonical books say, and knows not the systematic recitation of the tradition (*krama*), then leave all that to Me, *trusting thyself absolutely to Me*". The latter is his explanation of *madyogam āśrita*, which Śrīdhara also equates to "taking refuge in Me alone". He continues:—"In this sense I have already written the following verses in my *Laghu-prakriyā*—*The Easy Way to Salvation*—

"... However I have heedlessly digressed from the path of true insight, mayest thou pardon me, O Lord of all, who art full of compassion, for though I was certainly foolish, yet was I thy *bhakta* and 'troubled in spirit' (*ārta*, repentant). Bringing to thee such praise, (*anena stotra-yogena*), *I trust myself to thee*. But not thus would I try to account myself one who deserves thy grace."

In the "divine books" (*pārameśvareshu siddhānta-śāstreshu*, which obviously included *Prapatti-Bhakti* doctrines), this is the sense of "to trust oneself to"; and thus in these works the term *ātma-nivedana* (offering oneself to the Deity) must have taken the place of *Prapatti*.

(3). Further, he interprets *jñānam*, in *v.* 12, simply as *āveśa*

¹ cf. *The Gītā*, x. 9

(Apte's *Dictionary*, devotedness), the directing of the spirit towards God, while *dhyāna* is for him *bhagavadmayatvam*—the being full of God, or a spirit that is filled with God. Hence *jñānam* is “better” than *abhyāsa*, since the latter is only the means to the former; *dhyāna*, again, is “better” than *jñāna*, which is completed only in the pious spirit's possession of God Himself.

(4). Thus, in *v. 12*, he correctly interprets the relation of the abandonment of the fruit (*phala-tyāga*) to *dhyānat* not in the sense of “better than”, which is meaningless, but as being the *result* of the renunciation of reward by the “devout mind”.

XII. 20: “*Dharmya-amritam idam*”: literally, that is, “this nectar corresponding to the *dharma*”, or “this sacred nectar”. But since a “nectar” cannot be “followed”, the term must be intended as a *Title* for this short *Bhakti-śāstram*; a *śāstram* (treatise) can be “followed”. Writers liked to give their Treatises such ornate and pompous Titles; thus *Saddharma Pundarīka* means “*The Lotus of the True Religion*”.

At the close of *The Nārada Pāñcarātram*,¹ *v. 11, 28*, we find:—“Thus have I proclaimed ‘this *jñāna-amritam*’ on the Earth. They who study this *śāstram* and practice it, etc.” This too is meant as a kind of Title; and in *II. 1, 14*, again, *jñānāmritam* is evidently employed as the Title of a treatise (*śāstram*) that was ‘taught at the very beginning of creation.

XIII. 28: We find here a further example of the method adopted by the Glossographers of immunizing, *in advance*, by their own special interpretation, some term that occurs later on in the *Text*. By the expression “sees truly” in *v. 29*, the writer of the Treatise means simply the typical *Sāṅkhya-viveka*—the *Sāṅkhya* discrimination. But the author of the Gloss *anticipates* this expression and inserts in it his own mystical viewpoint, so as subsequently to effect an unconscious association with this. And his reader falls into the trap!

XIII. 33: The Epistemology of *Sāṅkhya*: only “illumination” by means of *jñāna* converts the activities of the senses, of *manas* and of *buddhi*, into processes of knowledge, and the objects into the objects of knowledge.²

XIII. 34: In this *Sa-Īśvara-Sāṅkhya*, as in *Sa-Īśvara-Yoga*, God is only the helper to the goal, but obviously not the goal

¹ Calcutta, 1865.

² cf. p. 294 on VII. 4

itself; the latter is the *Kaivalyam* (ecstatic isolation) of the *ātman* released from *Prakṛiti* by the discriminative process of thought.

XIV. 3: cf. *Moksha-dharma*, 8509¹:—"When Iśvara awakes, when night ends, he once more transforms the *Aksharam Brahman* and lets it go forth from himself . . ." Although this passage is more ancient than our own it resembles it, since here too *Brahman* is regarded as being *subordinate* to Iśvara, and as *Nature*, fashioned by the Lord as Ruler. On the use of *Brahman* as equivalent to *Prakṛiti* cf. Otto Schrader in *Festgabe für H. Jacobi*.²

XV. 16: This is a very free use of the word *Purusha*. We may, however, compare *Moksha-dharma*, 8678, where the term *ātman* is even more freely employed. In the present instance the two forms of *Prakṛiti* itself, both as developed and as undeveloped, are called "the two *ātmānas*"; cf. again 8672.

XVI. 18: According to Śankara, "as witnesses of their evil life". But this can hardly be correct. Rather does the writer of this Treatise evidently share the view that God, abiding in His own and some other body, is Himself affected by the torments afflicting the body.

XVII. 1: This is a clumsy attempt to combine (A) and (B).³ In what precedes there has been no reference to the three *gunas*, nor any occasion to enquire about them. The succeeding passage, however, contains not a single syllable in answer to the question as to what becomes of him who possesses "faith without works".

XVII. 2: This expression is obviously no reply to the question of v. 1, since "faith without works", about which Arjuna ostensibly enquired, could be of *only* the *rajas* type. It is, on the other hand, clear that there begins here an entirely new and independent catalogue of virtues, with faith at its head.

XVIII. 20: This is certainly *not* the *Prakṛiti* of the *sāṅkhyas*, since to behold this could not possibly be of *sattva* type, but the One real (*sad eva ekam*), which evidently appertained to the ancient doctrine of the three *gunas*; and these are in fact typified in the sixth *Prapāthaka* of *The Chāndogya Upanishad*. Our author is a naïve monist; cf. XVI. 18.

XVIII. 34: *Dharma*, as associated with pleasure and gain (*kāma*

¹ Deussen, p. 335.

² Pp. 272 ff.

³ cf. pp. 186 ff.

and *artha*) is not law, but desert (*meritum*), in view of which man hopes for a heavenly reward.

XVIII. 36: The sage's serenity is attained by prolonged discipline in strenuous self-control. This begins by being bitter, but the result is sweet. Further, it is a stable condition which no pain can ever interrupt, and in which pain is thus actually obliterated, while on the other hand, after every sensuous delight it returns anew.

XVIII. 50. The preceding Treatise was a Wisdom Treatise, here *jñāna* is to be understood as in XVI. 1.

XVIII. 51 ff.: The ideal depicted is not that of the average *bhakta*, but of the *Bhakti-sādhu* (saint) who, actually, is a *sannyāsin*.

XVIII. 53: Here the "Brahman state" is obviously a *preliminary* stage. It denotes the "miraculous condition" of those who have overcome sense and the world, and dwell in the serenity of passionless spiritual peace.

XVIII. 55: In this passage, *Bhakti* too remains a preliminary phase, while the real ultimate means of salvation is *jñāna*; in v. 56, however, this relation is *reversed* in the sense of the resultant *Prapatti-Bhakti*.

XVIII. 60: "the Power of Destiny". Nature and *Karman* reciprocally condition one another; out of one's *Karman* proceeds his nature, and out of his nature new *Karman* :—backwards and forwards, therefore, in endless causal sequence.

XVIII. 66 "The laws", that Arjuna had defended in I. 40, 41, 43, 44; "the sins" that he had feared in I. 36; the "sorrow" which, in II. 8, was withering his senses and whose effect upon himself he did not realize. This conclusion of Krishna's speech does not prescribe any general doctrines of salvation for everyone, but reverts almost pedantically to the specific *durgāni* of Arjuna's concrete *vishāda*, based as this is on the actual situation.¹

¹ On *durgāni* cf. p. 142.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DR. OTTO'S WORKS

Gottheit und Gottheiten der Arier.

Vishnu-Nārāyana: Texte zur indischen Gottesmystik.

Siddhitraya des Yāmuna-muni: in *Logos*, 1928; *Zeitschrift für Religionspsychologie*, 1929, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1929.

Siddhānta des Rāmānuja.

Dipikā des Nīvāsa.

Das Gefühl des Überweltlichen.

Mysticism East and West.

India's Religion of Grace and Christianity.

INDEX

<p>Action, 48f., 55f., 58f., 91, 96, 105f., 109f., 113, 131, 171, 188f., 194, 206f.</p> <p>Acyuta, 22, 33, 36, 116, 255</p> <p><i>Adhibhūta</i>, <i>Adhibhūtam</i>, 70f., 219f.</p> <p><i>Adhidarva</i>, <i>Adhidarvam</i>, 70f., 219f.</p> <p><i>Adhiyajña</i>, <i>Adhiyajñas</i>, 70f., 219f.</p> <p><i>Adhyātman</i>, <i>Adhyātman</i>, 40, 70f., 139f., 146, 154, 160, 219f.</p> <p><i>Advaita</i>, 65, 148, 151, 163f., 168f., 174, 177f., 182, 195, 214f., 235, 293</p> <p>Agni, 82, 88, 152</p> <p><i>Ahamkāra</i>, 141f., 154f., 160f., 198, 183, 198, 278, 294f.</p> <p><i>Aiśvara</i>, <i>Aiśvaryam</i>, 122f., 224f., 284</p> <p><i>Ajñāna</i>, 60, 95, 98</p> <p><i>Aksharam</i>, 71, 85, 88f., 170, 218, 285f.</p> <p>Almsgiving, 105f., 193</p> <p><i>An-Īvara</i>, 61, 130, 208</p> <p><i>Anugītā</i>, 15, 157, 183, 190f., 205f., 289, 293</p> <p>Arjuna, 10f., 15, 21f., 34f., 134f., 144f., 158, 168f., 176, 196, 203, 231f., 242f.</p> <p>Asat, 108</p> <p>Asceticism, 54f., 105f., 117, 193</p> <p><i>Aśvathha</i> fig tree, 82, 100f.</p> <p><i>Ataraxia</i>, 47, 128</p> <p><i>Ātman</i>, 50, 60, 81, 96, 110, 125, 140, 146f., 155, 166, 184f., 220, 238f.</p> <p>Autumn, 200f., 267f.</p> <p>Being, 71f., 77, 88, 95, 100, 108, 118, 121, 140, 149, 180f., 184f., 197, 221, 224, 254, 260, 275</p>	<p><i>Bhakta</i>, <i>Bhakti</i>, 9, 12f., 61, 67f., 73, 76, 78f., 90f., 97f., 113f., 130, 143f., 148, 154f., 162f., 168f., 172f., 177f., 185f., 195f., 199, 209f., 213f., 219f., 223, 228f., 234f., 264f., 273f., 291f., 294f.</p> <p><i>Bhakti-mārga</i>, 168f., 211</p> <p><i>Bhakti-Yoga</i>, 80, 129, 195</p> <p>Bhishma, 21f., 35f., 86, 132, 136, 140</p> <p>Brahma, <i>Brahmā</i>, 48, 50, 61f., 70f., 85, 88, 100, 123, 152, 181, 218, 230</p> <p><i>Brahma-bhava</i>, 14, 62, 151, 182, 195f., 229, 282</p> <p><i>Brahma-Nirvāna</i>, 14, 182, 199, 219, 282f., 293</p> <p>Brahman, 10, 13f., 50, 55f., 59f., 65f., 70f., 74f., 80, 90f., 95f., 100f., 108, 114, 122f., 129f., 151, 155, 165f., 180f., 188, 195f., 200, 208f., 218f., 228, 232f., 239f., 253, 285f., 289, 297</p> <p><i>Brahman-Ātman</i>, 96, 170, 234</p> <p>Buddhi, 43f., 48f., 79, 94, 111, 138, 183, 207, 228, 237f., 284</p> <p><i>Buddhi-Yoga</i>, 80, 114, 227f., 238f., 283f.</p> <p>Caste, 113, 193f.</p> <p>Causation, 276f.</p> <p>Character-Yoga, 128, 163, 187, 204f., 209, 239, 287</p> <p>Cow of desires, 49, 82</p> <p>Creation, Creator, 53, 75, 80f., 88, 216, 223</p> <p>Delusion, 68f., 76, 99f., 136, 142, 212f.</p>
--	---

Destiny, 11, 33, 110, 114, 143, 188, 302

Deussen, 183, 190, 192, 205f., 234, 241, 249, 293, 301

Devas, 27, 79f.

Dharma, 74f., 113, 143f., 168, 175, 301f.

Dharma-yāmritam, 90f., 162, 167, 175, 300

Dhṛitarāshṭra, 10, 21f., 34f.

Diet, 106f., 193

Doer, 111, 188, 194

Dualism, Duality, 74f., 103f., 186f., 222

Duryodhana, 10f., 21f., 34f., 242

Duty, 113, 143, 168

Dvāta, 74f., 217, 222f.

Equanimity, 65, 114

Equanimity-Yoga, 47, 229, 282, 285

Eschatology, 212f., 221f.

Evil, 52, 55, 70, 101, 113, 181f., 201, 230

ἡσυχία, 47, 197

Faith, 66, 105f., 113, 116, 178f., 192f., 213, 219

Field, 93f., 190, 200f

Fig tree, 82, 100f., 251

Firmness, 105f., 111f.

Freedom, 113, 128, 193, 213, 288

Garbe, 13f., 85, 95, 148f., 154, 165f., 182, 185, 191, 193, 201, 207, 210f., 213f., 216f., 218, 220f., 226, 233, 269, 281, 295

Glosses, 14f., 76, 208

God, 9f., 14, 53, 69, 73, 76, 79f., 84f., 91, 115, 122, 127f., 136f., 140f., 149, 153f., 158f., 163f., 177f., 184f., 197, 210f., 214f., 222f., 230f., 235, 260, 277, 288, 294f.

Grace, 114f., 142, 145, 176, 193, 214, 287

Gunas, 9, 44, 49f., 54, 68f., 95f., 98f., 105f., 110, 122, 162f., 178f., 183, 187f., 193f., 212, 216f., 231, 282, 295

Happiness, 61, 64f., 100, 105f., 112, 182, 194, 228

Hari, 9, 28, 84, 116

Harivamśa, 123f., 154, 196, 206, 243f., 249f., 253f., 257f., 259f., 262f., 268, 270, 280

Hill, 13, 44, 51, 66, 82, 110, 117, 183

Ignorance, 60, 95, 116

Immanence, 186, 223, 242, 254, 272

Indra, 35, 38, 49, 77, 82, 125, 152, 240, 243, 247, 260f., 280

Īśvara, 12, 43, 47, 93, 102, 117, 125, 129f., 137f., 150f., 151f., 161, 166, 170, 186, 196, 208, 210, 211, 217, 220, 221, 227f., 269, 272, 292, 301

Janaka, 50, 121, 230

Jñāna, 52f., 57f., 61, 76, 94f., 98, 102, 116, 166, 174f., 177f., 181, 195f., 199f., 204, 232, 238f., 288f., 299f.

Judgment, 105f., 111, 194

Kaivalya, Kaivalyam, 61, 130, 199, 207f., 273, 292, 301

Kāla, 30, 87, 135, 149, 281

Kant, 120, 238

Karma, Karman, 43f., 49f., 53f., 57, 66, 70f., 78, 113, 124, 127f., 143, 188, 193, 205f., 210f., 220, 229f., 283, 286f., 302

Karma-mārga, 66, 130, 172f., 204f
Karma-Yoga, 43f., 96, 124, 130, 195, 204f., 290
Karna, 13, 21, 35, 86, 136
K. Kashmir Recension, 39, 47, 52, 60f., 64, 69, 73, 98, 102, 105, 108, 112, 114, 115, 280f
Kauravas, 10f., 34f., 132
Knower, Knower of the Field, 93f., 190, 200f., 212
Knowledge, 52f., 56, 60, 67f., 74f., 92f., 105f., 110, 113f., 116, 166, 174, 177f., 184f., 188f., 194, 202, 208, 212, 226, 231f
Krishna, 9f., 15, 34f., 43f., 58f., 79f., 88, 116, 132f., 142f., 147, 152f., 158f., 163f., 176, 194f., 211, 221, 227f., 235f., 239f., 242f., 253f., 258f., 262f., 266f., 280f., 298f.
Krishna-Arjuna-samvāda, 12, 164
Law, Laws, 11, 24, 37, 54, 100, 115, 134, 182, 186f., 192, 213
Lord, 12, 43, 53, 67f., 70f., 79f., 84f., 96f., 100f., 199, 224f., 273f., 288
Luther, 119, 218
Magic, 117f., 128f., 151f., 183, 196, 218, 232, 241
Mahābhārata, 10, 74, 132, 147, 152f., 155f., 249, 256
Māhātmyam, 140, 160, 226, 236
Majesty, 139f., 160, 226, 236
Manas, 63f., 82, 94, 101, 205f., 237f.
Manu, Manus, 27, 53, 79, 138, 160, 270
Matter, 75, 94, 146, 178f., 185
Māyā, Māyin, 68f., 117f., 148, 153, 216f., 245, 288, 295

Meditation, 62f., 174
Moksha, 109f., 154
Moksha-dharma, 132f., 157f., 182, 186f., 281f., 301
Monism, 177f., 184f.; 191, 223, 294
Mountains, 239, 244f., 255
Mysticism, 166, 214f., 234
Nara, 239, 245f., 256f., 261f.
Narasiṃha, 239f., 250, 256
Narayana, 9, 12, 151, 239f., 256f., 260f., 265f., 269f., 280f
Nature, 9f., 49f., 59f., 67f., 75f., 95, 101f., 118, 122, 127, 146, 184f., 205, 261f., 274f., 302
Nature of God, 53f., 67f., 75f., 139, 212f., 217, 226, 294f
New Testament, 9, 120
Nirvāna, 48, 61, 63, 77, 210f., 219, 282
Non-Being, 77, 88, 95, 118
Non-Duality, 65, 151, 174, 177f., 216
Numen, 166, 234f., 241f., 250, 255, 270
Oldenberg, 145, 228, 249, 262, 270
Old Testament, 120, 269
OM, 67, 72f., 76, 82, 108
Omnipotence, 119, 137, 141, 148, 160
Pairs, 40, 44, 55, 58, 63, 70, 101
Pāndavas, 10f., 21f., 34f., 83, 132, 152
Peace, 77, 115, 156, 204, 207, 211
Person, 71, 84, 100f.
Power, 27, 33, 53, 68f., 75, 80f., 84f., 88, 92f., 114, 117f., 139, 143, 151, 156, 160, 173, 196, 200f., 218, 223f.,

232, 239f., 247f., 251f., 260f., 270, 277, 295, 302

Prajāpati, 49, 88, 269

Prajñā, 46, 229

Prakṛiti, 59f., 75, 98, 146, 180f., 191f., 199f., 206, 217, 224, 269, 301

Prapatti, 167, 173f., 178, 299

Prapatti-Bhakti, 90f., 162f., 168f., 299

Prapatti-Yoga, 195

Purusha, *41, 60, 71f., 80, 146, 181, 189f., 199f., 205f., 248, 262, 271, 276, 301

Rajas, 52, 65, 68, 98f., 105f., 109f., 189f

Rāmānuja, 69, 115, 159, 170, 184, 199, 215, 226, 281

Rapture, 127, 174, 210

Reality, 113, 156

Rebirth, 66, 72f., 100, 171

Redemption, 9, 154, 179f., 187, 199

Renunciation, 49f., 58f., 62, 78, 108f., 175

Resolution, 78, 121f.

Roy, 153, 182, 189, 208

Rudra, 152, 156f., 164f., 241, 248, 253

Sacrifice, 32, 49f., 54f., 76f., 82, 89f., 105f., 116, 163, 193f., 231f., 246f., 289f.

Sa-Īśvara-Śāṅkhya, 93f., 163, 199, 300f.

Sa-Īśvara-Yoga, 43f., 61, 80, 125f., 130, 163, 209f., 214, 228, 291f., 300f.

Salvation, 58, 66, 113, 128, 176, 180f., 190, 199f., 208f., 212f., 275

Samādhi, 127, 229

Samsāra, 9, 44f., 49f., 68, 75f., 100f., 116, 121, 142, 171, 180f., 185f., 193, 200, 212, 287

Sanatsujāta-parvan, 82, 183, 283, 287f

Śankara, 41f., 45, 68, 77, 82, 89f., 115, 215, 283f., 301

Sankarshana, 152, 157, 245, 265f

Śāṅkhya, Śāṅkhyas, 9, 38f., 49f., 57f., 67, 96f., 104, 110, 129, 145, 162f., 177f., 187f., 191f., 199, 204f., 208f., 217, 227f., 233, 273f., 300

Sannyāsa, Sannyāsin, 49f., 78, 92f., 105f., 108f., 113, 130, 171, 175, 188f., 193f., 203f., 208f., 285, 290f

Śānti, 156, 204, 207f., 229f., 292

Śāntiparvan, 180, 208, 256f., 259, 270

Sapientia, 46, 83

Sa-Śāṅkhya-Bhakti, 97f., 162, 177f.

Sat, 108f

Sattva, Sattvam, 68, 98f., 105f., 109f., 187f., 193, 282

Schrader, 47, 60, 266, 280f., 287, 292, 301

Self, 60, 64f., 69f., 84, 96f., 102, 110, 121, 125, 139f., 143f., 160, 210

Siddha, Siddhas, Siddhi, 29f., 67f., 82, 86f., 98, 122, 125, 193f., 210, 219, 277, 284

Sin, Sins, 115, 134

Soul, 67, 127, 184

Spirit, 73, 81, 95f., 102, 127, 146, 178f., 184f., 211, 235, 248f., 276f., 292

Śrīdhara, 71, 218, 286f., 293, 298

Śrivatsa, 274f.

Stoicism, 128, 228

Śuddha-sattvam, 73, 221, 296

Śuka, 119f., 187, 205

Śvadharma, 105f., 112, 193f.

Tamas, 68, 98f., 105f., 109f., 189f.

Tapas, 54, 57, 117, 194, 251, 288f
Tat, 108
Tattvas, *Tattvavidas*, 40, 57, 183f., 205f., 233, 279
Tejas, 196, 251
Theophany, 11f., 141, 148, 151f., 234
 Thomas, E. J., Dr., 17, 50, 149
 Thought, 43, 60, 204f., 237f
 Transcendence, 76, 120, 128, 156, 233f.
 Treatise—
 I, 90f., 164f., 273
 II, 97f., 177f., 198f
 III, 103f., 186f., 282
 IV, 93f., 198f.
 V, 58f., 203f., 208
 VI, 62f., 181, 208f., 233
 VII, 43f., 203f., 227f.
 VIII, 67f., 80f., 217, 233f., 295f.
 Treatises, 14, 132f., 162f.
 Tree of Evil, 182f.
Tyāga, *Tyāgin*, 108f., 188
 Universe, 149f., 177f., 184f., 212f., 221f., 225, 231f., 250f., 254f., 260f., 270f., 274, 295f.
Upanishads, 94, 101, 108, 146, 154, 215
Bṛihadāraṇyaka, 74, 285
Bṛihad-Jābāla, 241
Chāndogya, 74, 268, 282, 301
Īśā, 214
Katha, 42, 100, 121, 205
Kaushituki, 234
Narasiṁha, 241

Praśna, 74
Śarva, 241
Śvetāśvatara, 151, 166
 Vāsudeva, 9, 32, 69, 83, 89, 116, 151, 156f., 164, 196, 219, 226f., 239f., 253f., 257, 265f., 269, 297
Vedānta, Vedantic, 10, 94, 102, 148, 151, 179, 200f., 214
Vedas, Vedic, 10, 13, 32, 44, 49f., 56f., 66f., 72f., 76f., 81f., 89f., 100f., 108, 121f., 143f., 154, 157, 183, 220, 226f., 232, 240, 246, 253f., 266, 289
Vedic Hymns, 50, 149
 Vishnu, 9, 72f., 81, 86f., 151, 156, 164f., 196, 239f., 248f., 253, 257f., 261, 268f., 272, 287
 Vishnu-dharma, 274f.
Viśiṣṭādvaita, 177f., 184, 209, 223f., 291, 294
 Wholly other, The, 156, 224
 Will, 65, 120, 128f., 144, 168, 204f., 208, 224, 288
Yajña, 54f., 76, 231f., 288f.
 Yāmunamuni, 184, 215, 226
Yoga, *Yogin*, 9, 43f., 49f., 53f., 57f., 62f., 67, 71f., 78f., 91f., 96, 102, 116f., 145, 162f., 166, 174, 177f., 187f., 195, 204f., 208f., 218, 224f., 227f., 233, 273f., 277, 288f



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
LONDON 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
LEIPZIG (F VOLCKMAR) HOSPITALSTR 10
CAPE TOWN 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET
TORONTO 91 WELLINGTON STREET, WEST
BOMBAY 15 GRAHAM ROAD, BALLARD ESTATE
WELLINGTON, N.Z. 8 KINGS CRESCENT, LOWER HUTT
SYDNEY, NSW AUSTRALIA HOUSE, WYNYARD SQUARE

THOUGHT AND REALITY

HEGELIANISM AND ADVAITA

by P. T RAJU, M A , PH.D.

Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

"This book deals with the problems of an idealist philosophy one by one: the infinite, the individual, negation, difference, truth and reality, the self and the mind. Dr. Raju's aim is to criticize Hegel from the standpoint of Bradley, and Bradley from that of Sankara."—*Church Times*

CAUSALITY AND SCIENCE

by NALINI BRAHMA

Cr. 8vo. 6s.

This book is at the same time an examination of the scientific concept of causality and a discussion of the metaphysics of the problem. It questions some of the fundamental assumptions of science and raises several important philosophical issues. In particular the Indian concept of causality is explained, examined and compared with corresponding Western views. The author endeavours to show the reconciliation between freedom and mechanism, spirit and nature, religion and science by explaining that determinism in the effect is quite consistent with indeterminism in the cause. The ever-puzzling doctrine of Maya or the theory that the world is an illusion is here given an intelligible explanation.

RELIGION AND THE GOOD LIFE

ZOROASTRIANISM

by R. P. MASANI, M.A.

Cr. 8vo. 6s.

"It serves a useful purpose in providing a concise popular and instructive exposition of the Zoroastrian religion both as it was in the time of its founder and as it is practised to-day."—*Inquirer*